



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The American Catholic quarterly review

205
A5123



LELAND · STANFORD · JUNIOR · UNIVERSITY

3297- 275-23

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat
invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XI.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1886.

LIBRARY
OF THE
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

134295

COPYRIGHT, 1886.

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

YRAN
1886. OCTOBER 10 A.M.
VTRN 1886

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHURCH AND STATE—IN ENGLAND. By <i>Arthur F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.),</i>	1
Political bearings of Disestablishment, 1; The English Church and the Scotch Kirk, 2; The many measures which the question of principle must affect, 3; How the matter stands in equity, 4; How Churchmen view the change sympathetically, 5; Equivocal character of the Church itself, 6; How Dissenters view the change, 8; Is the scope of the arguments in favor of the pruning knife or of the axe? 9; The question of first principles in the matter, 11; The final Anglican fallacy, 12; Why Catholics should regret the obliteration of the Church of England, 13; Reasons for supposing that it will be let alone for some time yet, 14.	
HOW IRELAND HAS KEPT THE FAITH SINCE CROMWELL'S TIME. By <i>Bryan J. Clinche,</i>	16
The Cromwellian episode in the history of English Protestantism, 16; Condition of Ireland at the accession of Charles II., 17; The Irish hierarchy at that time, 18; Preparatory training for the Priesthood, 19; Irish seminaries on the Continent, 20; The English Government creating dissensions among the Irish Catholics, 21; Primate Plunkett, the brief respite under James II., 22; Violation of the treaty of Limerick, 23; The bitter persecution of the eighteenth century, 24; Laws against trade, industry, and education, 25; Setting a premium on apostasy, 26; The great bulk of the Irish Catholics reduced to the lowest poverty, 27; The merciless charter schools, 28; Fruitlessness of the persecution, 29; Final triumph of Irish Faith, 30.	
ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VISITATION NUNS IN THE WEST. By <i>Paul R. Shipman,</i>	31
Origin and character of the Visitation Order, 31; Its founders, 32; Its introduction into this country and establishment in the Diocese of Baltimore, 33; One of the fairest and most vigorous of the Mother Convent's offspring, 35; Difficulties of a journey from Baltimore to the Mississippi, 35; A comedy act on the Mississippi, 36; The Nuns' arrival at Kaskaskia and their first friends there, 37; Offered shelter by the Morrisons, 38; Flitting up a convent, 39; Compelled to seek larger quarters, 40; Finally installed in a fairly comfortable building, 41; Increase of both boarders and day scholars, 42; Their first Christmas in the West, 43; Was it a ghost? 44; Resolving to erect a building of their own, 45; Description of and life in their new house, 46; Difficulties attending bricklaying there, 47; An intensely cold winter, 48; Nearly all the Sisters are taken ill, 49; A particularly sad death, 50; The first and last superior at Kaskaskia, 51; Catastrophe befalls Kaskaskia, 52; In what condition Bishops Kenrick and Quarter found the place, 53; Rescued and taken to St. Louis, 53; The Nuns' first home in St. Louis, 54; The community again permanently unified, 55; Building a permanent home, 56; The prosperity and fame it has since attained, 57.	
WHAT ARE ANIMALS AND PLANTS? By <i>Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S.,</i>	58
How animals and plants stand toward each other, 58; Things that have here to be taken into account, 59; Classes of inorganic substances, 60; Contrasts between the non-living and living world, 61; The six very remarkable powers of protoplasm, 62; Characteristics of every living creature, 63; Alliance between habit and instinct, 65; How we ought to regard the world of living creatures, 66; The influence of surrounding nature upon our knowledge, 67; Men of science and the doctrine of vital force, 68; Illustrating the life of an organism, 69; Supremacy of human reason, 70; The essential distinction between living beings and those devoid of life, 71; The most certain object of all knowledge, 72; The relations of animals and plants to each other, 73; The most obvious distinctions between them, 74; Animal characteristics that plants have not, 75.	
THE ENCYCLICAL "IMMORTALE DEI." By <i>Rt. Rev. F. S. Chatard, D.D.,</i>	76
The present condition of the Christian World, 76; The Pope on civil society and authority, 77; Revolution as now advocated by the secret societies, 79; What the Holy Father says about the Church in its relation to the State, 80.	
WHAT CAN BE DONE FOR THE ORPHANS? By <i>John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.,</i>	81
The orphans have always been a constant parochial charge in this country, 81; Necessity and increase of orphan asylums, 82; How the orphans are disposed of, 83; Difficulties in their way, 84; Practical experiments with orphans, 85; What might further be done, 86; Reasons for removing asylums from cities, 87; Catholics must never regard orphans as a burthen, 88.	

	PAGE
THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE IRISH QUESTION. By "C"	89
Result of the British elections of 1885, 89; The change does not mean an immediate concession of self-government to Ireland, 90; National independence in the idea of Irish Home Rule, 91; English opinion not the only factor to be conciliated, 92; English greed of power the great obstacle to Home Rule, 93; The amount of Home Rule that will satisfy both England and Ireland, 94; The difficulty about the control of the police, 95; The concessions that England may give, 96; England's sacrifice a very serious and material one, 97; The connection with the Empire which Ireland would accept, 98; The material difficulties in the way may be speedily disposed of, 99.	
THE SUPERNATURAL AND INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT. By <i>F. J. Cummings</i> ,	100
Vulgar confusion as to the nature and influence of religion, 100; The line of argument to be pursued in the present instance, 101; The doctrines of the modern school and the rejection of the supernatural, 102; Inflicting injury on both philosophy and literature, 103; Poets, to be great, must be Christians, 104; A picture of mediæval scholasticism, 105; But the scholastics were not faultless, 107; What is requisite to appreciate the great mediæval giants, 108; The lesson derived from the proper study of poetry, 109; The poetic dedication of nature, 110; The pictures which poetry should present to us, 111; A state of existence baffling all human inquiry, 113; What keeps man from being a monster, 113; The influence of the supernatural upon poetry is incalculable, 114.	
A NATIONAL CATHOLIC LIBRARY. By "S,"	115
The public and private Catholic libraries that already exist, 115; Absence of Catholic books from the public secular libraries, 116; Catholic books in the private libraries of Protestants, 117; Protestant ignorance of Catholic doctrines and practices, 118; A grand central Catholic library is needed, 119; A case which especially calls for endowments, 120; The good arising from the proposed library, 121; It must have smaller local libraries to assist it, 122.	
ST. CYPRIAN AND THE ROMAN SEE. By <i>Arthur H. Cullen</i> ,	123
The distorted view of St. Cyprian held by Anglicans, 123; How they come into conflict with St. Augustine, 124; Anglicans cannot understand the grace of humility, 125; Various interpretations given by the enemies of the Papacy, 126; A thoroughly Anglican and illogical idea, 127; Scope of Ballerini's interpretation, 128; Other views of the celebrated passage, 129; St. Cyprian's speech at the Council of Carthage, 130; Another awkward Anglican position, 131; How the Saint speaks of the Roman See in other passages, 132; Real meaning of the words under consideration, 133; Consistency requires this interpretation, 134; The other bishops at the Council, 135; The primacy of St. Peter, 136; Consideration of other extracts from St. Cyprian's writings, 137; Why he would not fall into glaring inconsistency, 138; The leading idea in his mind, 139.	
A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FATHER ROBERT MOLYNEUX, S.J. By <i>Rev. William P. Treacy, S.J.</i> ,	140
Life in Philadelphia during the War of Independence, 140; Religious ministrations for the Catholic soldiers, 141; Character of Father Molyneux, 142; Distinguished Catholic laymen then in Philadelphia, 143; The education of the youth, 144; Arduous, incessant, and fruitful labors of Father Molyneux, 145; Sketch of his career, 146; His missions after leaving Philadelphia, 147; Restoration of the Society of Jesus, 149; Early Jesuit missionaries in Philadelphia, 150; Father Molyneux's virtues, 151; His many distinguished friends, 152; His end, 153.	
A FEW WORDS MORE ON THE NEW BIBLE. By <i>Rt. Rev. J. A. Corcoran, D.D.</i> ,	154
Predictions against revision that were of no avail, 154; Professor Marsh's reasons against revision, 155; But revision has come, notwithstanding, 156; Awkward position of the American revisers, 157; Is this revision a success? 158; Some of the sectarian dross still remains, 159; An example in point, 160; Calvin's interpretation of St. James, 161; Catholics would not alter the text, 162; Protestant dishonesty in regard to the text, 163; Shirking difficulties, 164; Liberalistic tendency of the revisers, 165; Illustration by example, 166; St. Jerome and the revisers, 167; The next revision will be done by Americans, 168.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. J. M. Degni, S.J.</i> ,	169
Scientific education, 169; Astronomy—New star in Andromeda, 171; Physics and chemistry—Electrical furnaces and the aluminum compounds, 172; Decomposition of didymium, 173; Composite photography, 174; Geology—Flood-rock explosion as an artificial earthquake, 176.	
THE ROMAN QUESTION. By <i>Rt. Rev. James O'Connor, D.D.</i> ,	193
Material improvements in Rome since 1870, 193; A well-behaved people and dull business, 194; Excessive taxation, prison reports, the poor, 195; The charities of Rome, 196; Charities founded by the Popes, suppressed by the Piedmontese invaders, 197; The temporal power of the Pope, 198; The electoral body in Italy, 199; Italy's present condition is very sad indeed, 200; How will the temporal power be restored? 201; Reasons why the Pope should be free, 202; He should be free in appearance as well as in fact, 203; Nature of the temporal power, 204; Political life in Rome after 1870, 205; The outrage to the remains of Pope Pius IX., 206; Catholics and the unity of Italy, 207; Outlook from the present state of things, 208; The Pope's present position nothing new in history, 208.	

Table of Contents.

v

	PAGE
ART AND ARTISTS—GIORGIO VASARI. By <i>John A. Mooney</i> ,	210
Is it art, or only a pretender, that has settled among us? 210; The influence of education, 211; What a skilful historian may do for us, 212; Vasari's position among artists, 213; The young Giorgio finds a patron, 214; Other problems than art that he had to deal with, 215; Vasari and the Medici, 216; After severe studies he tries his powers, 217; He gains a position of independence in the world, 218; Some of his works and friends, 219; Patronized by Pius V., 220; Gathering material for his "Lives of the Painters," 221; Vasari shows us the man as well as the artist, 222; His style and other characteristics, 223; His work is a guide to the study of art, 224; Michel Angelo's tribute, 225.	
PRIMITIVE MAN AND HIS SPEECH. By <i>Very Rev. Edward Jacker</i> ,	226
Professor Whitney on philology, 226; How he places the problem before us, 227; His view of the cause of language-making, 228; The origin of language and the problem of man's origin, 229; Language and the Darwinian hypothesis, 230; Darwinism not to Mr. Whitney's taste, 231; Mere animal faculties and the production of human speech, 232; Evolution and the possibility of distinctly rational speech, 233; In what condition of utterance and voice were man's immediate progenitors? 234; Views of the Jesuit Father Pesch (footnote), 235; Can the doctrine of creation be reconciled with the evolution theory? 236; A possible construction of the evolutionist hypothesis (footnote), 237; What creation strictly means, 238; Man's primitive condition in regard to language, 239; Mr. Whitney's theory intrinsically inconsistent, 240; How the problem of the origin of language now stands in the world of science, 241.	
THE CHURCH IN CANADA UNDER THE FRENCH REGIME. By <i>D. A. O'Sullivan</i> ,	242
The term establishment with reference to the Church in Canada, 242; Bearing of the encyclical "Immortale Dei" on this question, 243; The Catholic Church cannot be "established by law," 244; This term restricted to national churches, 245; How the case of England is pertinent to the present subject, 246; Position of the Church in England before Henry VIII., 247; How he changed it, 248; A comparison with the Church of France, 249; The Gallican declaration, 250; Ranke's view of the case, 251; Canada's relation to the Gallican Church, 252; The two kinds of establishments, 253; The ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Canada, 254; A quotation from Parkman, 255; The Abbé Queyles and Mgr. Laval, 256; Bishop St. Vallier, 257; An exhibition of the true Gallican spirit, 258; Opposition to the Gallican ordinances, 260; Jurisdictional position of the See of Quebec, 261; More evidence against the Gallican character of the Church in Canada, 262; Examination of particular Gallican claims, 264; Need of a history of the Church in Canada, 265.	
CATHOLICITY IN ITALY. By <i>Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, I.D. (Laval)</i> ,	266
A strange scene in the Roman College, 266; The clever strategy of the Pope's enemies, 267; Work of the anti-Christian propagandism in Rome, 268; What the Papacy and the monastic life have suffered in Italy, 269; Why the Papacy should be free, 270; Necessary characteristics of the Papacy, 271; Proof that the Pope is not free in his own city, 272; Leo XIII. on the Temporal Sovereignty, 273; And on the condition of Rome, 274; The kind of education given in the Italian university schools, 275; More of the Revolution's work, 276; The Pope on divorce laws and State education, 277; What the natural consequence is, 278; Ruinous state of the Italian finances, 279; Government opposition to new appointments of bishops, 280; The law of military service for ecclesiastics, 281; The real character of Rome, 282; Anti-Christian laws on matrimony, 283; How things have changed in Italy since 1848, 284; Cantù on Catholicity in Italy, 285.	
LECTURES AND CATHOLIC LECTURE BUREAUS,	287
The important proportions which lecturing has recently assumed, 287; Lesson of the passage of arms between Socrates and Phædrus, 288; The imparting of oral teaching, 289; The different kinds of lecturing, 290; Two requisite conditions for university purposes, 291; The university extension movement in England, 292; The financial obstruction barring the way, 293; The activity lately exhibited in Catholic lecturing, 294; Work of the Catholic lecture bureau of St. Louis, 295; Difficulties in the way of an enterprise like this, 296; An observation upon the subjects treated, 297; The positive side of this work for Catholics, 298.	
THE TRADITIONAL MISREPRESENTATION OF IRELAND. By <i>Bryan J. Clinche</i> ,	299
Hope fostered in the Irish breast by Mr. Gladstone, 299; But the paths of English politics are dark, 300; Reason of the excessive trust of the Irish in the pledges of foreign statesmen, 301; Consistency of the English government's policy of misrepresentation of Ireland, 303; Good effect of the increasing knowledge of the Irish people, 304; It is well if the day of Irish trust in English statesmen has gone, 305.	
GOD AND AGNOSTICISM. By <i>Conré B. Pallen, Ph.D.</i> ,	306
The Spencer-Harrison controversy, 306; Mr. Spencer's notion of ideology, 307; Are many of our conceptions truly unrepresentative? 308; Mr. Spencer's view of the three systems of philosophy accounting for the origin of the universe, 309; The hypothesis of self-creation, 310; An assumption without warrant, 311; And still another, 312; A wide hiatus in his argument, 313; Dean Mansel and the inconceivable, 314; Mr. Spencer conceiving an absolute which is dependent, 316; Trying to prove the inconceivability of the first cause, 317; Whence Mr. Spencer's whole difficulty proceeds, 318; He endeavors to demolish his own argument, 319; What Mr. Spencer's absolute really is, 320; Mr. Harrison has decidedly the advantage over him, 321.	

	PAGE
THE WAGE QUESTION. By <i>George D. Wolff</i> ,	322
Importance of the question of wages to the working man, 322; The right to live comes first in the natural order, 323; Prominent position which the wage question now occupies, 324; Relation of the wage worker to communism and socialism, 325; Capital dictates the price of labor, 326; Facts shown by examining the leading industries of Pennsylvania, 327; Tables of theoretical and actual wages, 328-333; Remarks on the Report of the Secretary of Internal affairs, 334; There should be no antagonism between capital and labor, 336; Injustice of the public press towards wage workers, 337; Facts easy for the newspapers to bring out, 338; The "Company store" and other abuses, 339; No wonder the wage workers sometimes act in defiance of the law, 340; Special instances of provocation in point, 341; Violences to property and persons, 342; Capitalists making money out of the strikes, 343; Wage workers not lawless as a class, 344.	
THE DECREES OF THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL. By <i>Rt. Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.</i> ,	344
This volume compared with the previous similar one, 344; Character of the enactments herein contained, 345; Office and duties of Consultors, Examiners, and Rural Deans, 346; Irremovable Rectors, 347; The life the clergy ought to lead, 348; Religious orders, Divine worship, Observance of Sunday, 349; On marriage, 350; Training of the clergy, higher education of the laity, parochial schools, 351; Rulings on Christian Doctrine and zeal for souls, 352; Societies of various kinds, church temporalities, the raising of church money by improper means, 353; Free space in churches, picnics, excursions, and other abuses, 354; Ecclesiastical trials and religious burial, 355; Superior character of the provisions of the Third Plenary Council, 355.	
THE CHURCH AND CREMATION. By <i>Rt. Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.</i> , . .	356
A letter to the editor on this subject, 356; Mr. Metcalfe's misconception, 357; What early Christian writers say, 358; Extract from Eusebius, 359; Is cremation necessary for public health? 360; Character of the men who urge the theory and practice of cremation, 361; Cremation may yet be enforced by law, 362.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. J. M. Degni, S.J.</i> ,	363
Scientists among the clergy, 363; Astronomy—The meteoric shower of November 27th, 1885, 367; Celestial photography, 369; Physics—Electricity, 370.	
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ANATOMICAL ANOMALIES. By <i>Professor Thomas Dwight, M.D.</i> ,	385
Deviations from the human structure often found in the human body, 385; Resemblance between man and other mammals, 386; Analogy in animals to crystallization in inorganic matter, 386; Review of some of the anomalies occasionally found in man, 388; How evolutionists make use of appearances, 389; Statements resting only on weak theories, 390; Testut's explanation of the anomalies of the biceps muscle, 391; Heredity as regards the facts here set forth, 392; The recurrence of variation and of its reproducing peculiarities, 393; Is the occurrence of anomalies consistent with the stability of species? 395.	
EDUCATION IN LOUISIANA IN FRENCH COLONIAL DAYS. By <i>M. A. C.</i> , . .	396
A subject neglected by contemporary educators, 396; Early exploration of the Mississippi, 397; A neglected pioneer of education in Louisiana, 398; How Bienville secured competent teachers, 399; Difficulties of the journey from Paris to New Orleans, 400; What this city was in 1727, 402; Establishment of the Nuns there, 403; Beginning of their work as teachers, 404; Nothing now remains of the dwellings of these exiles, 405; How they took care of the French orphans, 406; A religious procession in colonial days, 407; The religious in a new home, 408; A scene of quaint and gorgeous beauty, 409; The Ursulines particularly successful in developing the musical tastes of their pupils, 410; The educational advantages they gave to girls of every class, 411; Brilliant administration of Vaudreuil, 412; Dissensions among the clergy, 413; Louisiana under Spanish domination, 414; An Irish patron of the nuns, 415; The first girls' school erected in Louisiana fully described, 416.	
THE SPIRITUAL IDEA IN DANTE'S "DIVINA COMMEDIA." By <i>Brother Azarias</i> ,	418
Dante's work intimately connected with his age, 418; Character of the time in which he lived, 419; What inspired the chivalry of that day, 420; And then gave direction to studies, 421; Religion was the time-spirit of that age, 422; The existence of a spiritual life then recognized, 423; How we must enter upon this study, 424; Dante was proud, fiery, and irascible, 426; Circumstances under which his great poem was written, 427; His love for religion became a passion, 429; The common ground on which all supreme intelligences meet, 430; Dante's precursors, 431; Illustrations of his earnestness, 432; The central idea of the <i>Divina Commedia</i> , 433; The poet penetrates the workings of love in the Godhead, 434; How he was enabled to see the source of sin and passion, 436; The mystic surroundings in which he places himself, 438; The great lesson of the <i>Purgatorio</i> , 439; The way of personal purity and holiness, 442; The spirit which animates the poet, 443; The lesson taught him by St. Bernard, 445; The spiritual sense is a golden thread running through the whole poem, 446.	

Table of Contents.

vii

	PAGE
THE BRITISH EMPIRE—WHAT IT IS, AND WHAT ARE ITS RELATIONS TO IRELAND. By <i>Hon. John W Johnston</i> ,	448
What the British Empire is, 448; Component parts of the Indian Vice-royalty, 449; Of what the British Isles consist, 450; The Isle of Man, 451; The Channel Islands, 452; Other possessions in various parts of the world, 453; England taking lessons from the United States, 455; Advantageous position of British military posts, 456; An adequate idea of the extent of the British Empire, 457; But it has no general Constitution, 458; The Constitution, then, no bar in Ireland's way, 459; Nor even the Articles of Union, 460; The real reason for opposition, 461.	
THE CHURCH AND HER HOLYDAYS. By <i>John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.</i> ,	462
How we in America stand as subjects of the Kingdom of God on earth, 462; Accounting for the holidays, 463; An excellent theory that did not work well, 464; Former holidays in the Spanish portion of the present United States, 465; Exemption in favor of the Indians, 466; The holidays observed in the French settlements, 467; And in the British Isles and provinces, 468; The first synod of Baltimore, 469; Cession of Louisiana to the United States, 470; The Concordat with Napoleon, 471; The due observance of holidays always a subject of concern, 472; Ruling of Plenary and Provincial Councils, 474; A uniform discipline now prevails for the first time, 474; Probable result of the suppression of festivals, 475.	
DESCARTES' POSTULATE OF EXISTENCE. By <i>R. Meade Bache</i> ,	476
How we gain access to the truths through fictions, 476; Fundamental criteria for the validity of reasoning, 477; The skeptic's reply to the principle of contradiction, 478; Must we beg the very question of existence? 479; Assaults of Descartes' principle, 480; The light Balmez throws on the subject, 481; Even he has to beg the question, 483; No proposition can be framed to prove the fact of existence, 483; The materialistic view of consciousness, 486; May the <i>ego</i> be eliminated? 487; Descartes' principle is true, but inexpressible in formal terms, 488; An experience in point had by the present writer, 489; The <i>ego</i> and existence are thinkable, but not demonstrable, 490.	
THE PHILOSOPHY OF PRAYER. By <i>Rev. M. O. Riordan</i> ,	491
Prayer as an echo of the voice of humanity, 491; In every form of religion, 492; What prayer really implies, 493; Prayer is both a duty and a necessity, 494; But it does not constitute religion, 496; Prayer not incompatible with God's attributes, 496; Who the opponents of prayer are, 497; Disposing of difficulties on account of God's attributes, 498; The physical science objection is merely specious, 499; Denial of prayer's power in the physical world, 500; What happens as the result of prayer, 501; Prayer is offered for spiritual as well as for temporal blessings, 502; Professor Tyndall's ridiculous test, 503; Some reflections on it, 504.	
THE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH. By <i>John Charles Earle, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> ,	505
Dr. Palmer's visit to the Greek Church, 505; He assists at worship at St. Petersburg, 506; Origin of the Greek schism, 507; How far the Church is secularized in Russia, 508; Superstition among the Russians, 509; How Mr. Palmer joined the Greek Church, 510; What the authorities thought of his application, 511; Life in a Russian monastery, 512; Religion among the Russian people, 513; A priest with bewilderingly vague ideas of Church unity, 514; The daily life of a Russian priest, 515; Infidelity was then making inroads, 516; A Russian missionary to the Aleutian Islands, 517; Cardinal Newman and the character of Palmer's narrative, 518; Mr. Palmer's serious reflections in Moscow, 519; Charms of the Russian liturgy, 520; The patriarchal library, 521; Russia's first-class monasteries, 522; Lutheran converts to the Russian Church, 523; National characteristics, the icons, etc., 524; Excellent character of Mr. Palmer's narrative, 525.	
A GRANDDAUGHTER OF JOSEPH DE MAISTRE. By <i>M. H. Allies</i> ,	527
The subject of this memoir and her biographer, 527; Worthy descendants of the great writer, 528; The De Maistres are given a French home, 529; Inscrutability of God's ways, 530; A director indispensable in spiritual matters, 531; Through the ordeal of the baths, 532; Gradually bidding farewell to earth, 533; How the end came to Xaverine de Maistre, 534.	
THE RAILROAD AND KINDRED MONOPOLIES. By <i>George D. Wolff</i> ,	535
Democracy and class domination, 535; The real condition of the working classes, 536; The majority of our people are necessarily toilers, 537; The privileges and powers of corporations, 538; The evil doings of corporations, 539; Stock watering, 540; Instances in point, 541; How the public are robbed, 542; The press also demoralized, 543; Bolstering up weak corporations, 544; An enormous tax needlessly imposed, 545; Fictitious capitalization of anthracite coal monopolies, 546; Remedies proposed to prevent it, 548; Discrimination in favor of individuals and localities, 548; The Philadelphia Gas Works, 549; The Standard Oil Company, 550; Facts in proof, 551; Pennsylvania not favored by her great railroad, 552; Facts that prove this, 553; How much the State is made to lose, 555.	
THE ELECTIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRISH HOME RULE.	556
Dishonesty of the arguments against Home Rule, 556; It is a wonder the result was not worse, 557; Noble bearing of Messrs. Gladstone and Parnell, 558; Outcome of the electoral contest, 559; Home Rule has not experienced even a shadow of defeat, 560; On Ireland herself depends the final result, 561.	

	PAGE
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. J. M. Degni, S.J.</i> ,	562
Meteorological observations of the signal service, 562; Recent progress of the metallurgy of aluminium, 565; Photographs of the solar spectrum, 567; Pasteur and hydrophobia, 568.	
NATURE WORSHIP—THE NEW RELIGION. By <i>Very Rev. R. J. Meyer, S.J.</i> ,	577
Religion not a characteristic of the modern world, 577; Avowed object of the self-constituted leaders of modern thought, 578; Matthew Arnold betraying their secrets, 579; Modern science as an adversary of religion, 580; Relation of literature to our age, 581; The modern school of culture, 582; Emerson unreasonably admired, 584; Uniform aim of the whole school of culture, 585; The prevalent false views of art, 586; Improperly in art works, 587; Amenability of polite society to outside influences, 588; Evil results of Nature Worship in France, 590; Character of French infidelity, 591; How people are taught to scoff at religion, 592; It is criminal to pursue pleasure for the sake of pleasure, 593; How national deterioration takes place, 594; Effect of the want of definite religious principles, 595; The duty which Catholics owe to society, 596.	
THE MONKS AND CIVILIZATION. By <i>Rev. Edward F. X. McSweeney, D.D.</i> ,	597
The world is moved by the principled, not by principles, 597; Monks as mediators between rulers and ruled, 598; What they did for free government in England, 599; And the same is true of other States, 600; Always abundant opportunity for charity, 601; Apropos of an old mediæval Bible, 602; Universities founded by the monks, 603; Tributes of Maitland and Guizot, 604; The one vocation common to all the religious orders, 605; As to music, the monks have also made the world their debtors, 606; Character of their edifices, 607; Causes of the monks' decline and fall, 609; Many abuses had crept into their government, 610; What the worst of these were, 611; But the Church soon heals her wounds, 612.	
EDWARD HYDE AND HIS DAUGHTER. By <i>R. M. Johnston</i> ,	613
English disregard for good name, 613; Character and behavior of Edward Hyde, 614; His strange conduct towards his daughter, 615; Anne Hyde's person and character, 616; Her relations with the Duke of York, 617; Her father's dishonorable and indecent language, 618; Fidelity of the Duke of York to his wife, 619; The Chancellor's assertions as to his daughter must have been hypocritical, 620; Rapidity of his rise after her marriage, 621; A letter of King Charles II., 622; Clarendon in exile, 623; He dies in France neglected by his king, 624.	
HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ART. By <i>Rev. J. F. X. O'Connor, S.J.</i> ,	625
Father Garrucci's great work, 625; Its contents, 626; How he composed the book, 627; Nature of Christian art, 628; Religion and the beautiful, 629; Illustrations of the true principles in art, 630; Prophetic meaning expressed in early Christian pictures, 631; Peculiarities of some of the groups, 633; Three subjects concerning St. Peter, 634; The magnificent treasure contained in Fr. Garrucci's volumes, 635.	
IS THE CHURCH GAINING OR LOSING GROUND IN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES. By <i>Arthur F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> ,	636
Meaning of the issue here discussed, 636; Misapprehensions as to a government's political attitude towards the Church, 637; Relation of Catholics to political life, 638; as to France, its literature must be taken account of, 639; Positive nature of a Frenchman's character, 640; Exceptional character of the Roman question in Italy, 641; The hostile camps in Italy as well as in France, 642; The one immense gain in all times of persecution, 643; Reasons why non-Catholics suspect the Church to be weakening, 644; The real strength of the Church, 645; Increased respect for the head of the Catholic Church, 646; Advantage of Protestants as to scandals, 647; Proof that the Church is gaining ground, 648; A consoling conclusion drawn, 650.	
RELATIVE CONDITION OF WOMAN UNDER PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION. By <i>His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons</i> ,	651
Miserable life of woman in the ancient Pagan world, 651; The Germans an exception, according to Tacitus, 652; Domestic life in ancient Greece, 653; And in republican and Imperial Rome, 654; The model held up to Christian women, 655; Character of the holy women of Christianity, 656; How the Church has exalted woman, 657; Modern advocates of "woman's rights" degrade women, 658; Ennobling character of the Christian law of marriage, 659; Protestants on the evils of divorce, 660; Woman has not been ungrateful for the boon conferred by the Gospel, 661; Alarming increase of divorces in this country, 662; What the effect of the present evil tendency must be, 663; Why the mother should be the first instructor of her children, 664; Advice to mothers, 665.	
THE COMING CONFLICT IN THE EAST. By <i>A. de G.</i> ,	666
The recent events in the Balkan peninsula, 666; Review of the Eastern question since 1853, 667; The last Russo-Turkish war and its consequences, 668; Recent changes in the map of Europe, 670; Geographical reasons now actuating the Powers, 671; The sociological phase of the problem, 672; What business interests have to do with it, 673; The foreign policies of Russia and France, 674; The religious side of the question, 675; An "inspired" pamphlet bearing on the issue and on the Papacy, 676; What true statesmanship should do in the case, 678; Not much hope for the "Sick Man" of Europe, 679; The interests of the various powers, 680; Europe is on the eve of a tremendous conflict, 681.	

	PAGE
WILL THE TORIES GIVE IRELAND HOME RULE? By <i>Thomas Power O'Connor, M.P.</i> ,	682
<p>The outlook for Ireland when Parliament recently met, 682; Public opinion and the Home Rule controversy, 683; Lord R. Churchill reveals a new policy, 684; Advantage taken of it by the Gladstone Liberals, 685; They receive Churchill's speech with fierce joy, 686; The real issue between Gladstone and Chamberlain, 687; Sir W. Harcourt speaks for Gladstone, 688; How he damaged the Government, 689; Smallness of the Liberal Unionist vote in Parliament, 691; A considerable advance in the intentions of the Government, 693; Lord Randolph may outbid Gladstone, 694; He may be actuated by personal reasons, 695; The future of Home Rule seems assured in any case, 696; Effect of Tory Local government bill, 697; Why coercion may be resorted to, 698; The Tories have shown but little good sense so far, 699; The true way of escape from the Irish difficulty, 700.</p>	
WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE INDIANS? By <i>Very Rev. Edward Jucker</i> , . .	702
<p>The Third Plenary Council on missions to the Indians, 702; This missionary work not an easy task, 703; A brief review of the various Indian missions, 704; Admirable work of the Jesuits, 705; Government notices of certain missions (footnote), 707; The Indians will live and be civilized, 709; Discussion of the vitality of the North American Indians, 710; Those who will probably have the most numerous descendants, 712; Statistics of the process of absorption (footnote), 713; Capability of the Indian race for civilization, 714; Results in the Indian Territory due to white men (footnote), 715; Improved relations of the Government with the Indians, 716; All has not been failure under the agent system, 717; When Indians may be entrusted with property, 718; Beneficial influence of the better class of agents (footnote), 719; The Indians and the religious question, 720; Very sad missionary experiences, 721; Serious effect of a tribe's removal, 722; Protestant missionaries among the Indians, 723; Tribes that have no Christian missions, 724; Catholics and denominational Indian schools (footnote), 725; Abandonment of a bad agency practice (footnote), 727; A bigoted Presbyterian utterance (footnote), 728; A protest in which all Catholics should join, 729.</p>	
THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM AND PROTESTANTISM. By <i>George Dering Wolff</i> ,	730
<p>Present attitude of Catholics towards the public schools, 730; Why Protestants should feel sorely disappointed, 731; They will not support denominational schools of their own, 732; Protestants indirectly promoting infidelity, 733; The two principal denominational systems, 734; The plan generally adopted by most honest governments, 735; Excellent results of denominationalism, 736; No valid reason against denominationalism here, 737; How Catholics would be at a disadvantage, 738; Expense of the denominational system, 739; Failure of the present system virtually acknowledged, 740; Economy of denominationalism, 741; Public money wasted on high schools, 742; False economy of Protestant parents, 743; Catholics have won the battle of the schools, 744.</p>	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. J. M. Degni, S.J.</i> ,	745
<p>Recent earthquakes, 745; Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 746; Nature of this association, 747; Address of Prof. H. A. Newton, papers of the sections, 748; Physics, 749; Geology, 750; Biology and Anthropology, 751; Mechanism of authorship, 752.</p>	

BOOK NOTICES.

	PAGE		PAGE
Alethaurion, or Short Papers for the People (Moore).....	764	Life of St. Philip Benizi.....	188
Algebra, Elementary Treatise on (Bayma).....	384	Life of the Venerable Joseph Marchand..	574
Brownson's Works (Vol. XIX.).....	187	May Devotion, A Short and Practical (Deymann).....	384
Burke (Very Rev. T. N.), Fitzpatrick's Life of.....	373	Mistakes of Modern Infidels (North-graves).....	572
Chair of Peter (Murphy).....	181	Monotheism and the Law of Moses at Rome (Formby).....	752
Christian State of Life (Hunolt's Sermons on the).....	575	Month of May (Debussi).....	384
Christian Patience (Ullathorne).....	762	Mother of the King (Coleridge).....	757
Compendium Gradualis et Missalis Romanæ.....	575	Murphy Series of Illustrated Catholic Readers.....	576
Divine Office, The (Bacquez).....	766	Nine Months, The (Coleridge).....	183
Elements of Geometry (Bayma).....	384	Orphans and Orphan Asylums (Bort).....	763
English Bible, A Layman's Study of the (Bowen).....	764	Outlines of Universal History (Fisher)....	571
Englmann's Latin Grammar.....	767	Parnell Movement, The (O'Connor).....	380
Fall of Constantinople (Pears).....	189	Philosophy, Elements of (Hill).....	185
Flora, The Roman Martyr.....	571	Practical Introduction to English Rhetoric (Coppens).....	760
German Psychology of To-Day (Ribot).....	759	Praxis Synodalis.....	384
Gillow's Dictionary of English Catholics..	192	Preparation for Death (St. Liguori).....	383, 765
Greek Isles and Turkey (Field).....	767	Railways and the Republic (Hudson).....	767
Handbook of Christian Symbols, etc.....	576	Sanctuary Boys' Illustrated Manual (McCallen).....	768
Hoffmann's Catholic Dictionary.....	383	Sadler's Catholic Directory.....	383
Institutiones Morales Alphonsianæ.....	376	Scepsis Scientifica (Glanvill).....	178
Ireland's Cause Pleaded, etc. (O'Reilly)...	382	Stories of Duty (Egan).....	192
Keys of the Kingdom (Moriarty).....	191	Spirits of Darkness (Gmeiner).....	375
King Edward the Sixth (Lee).....	379	Studies in Church History (Parsons).....	755
Latin Poems of Leo XIII.....	763	Thirty Years, The (Coleridge).....	378
Leaves from St. Augustine (Allies).....	763	Triumphant Democracy (Carnegie).....	766
Life of Father Luke Wadding (O'Shea)...	768	Truth about John Wyclif, The (Stevenson).....	381
Library of St. Francis de Sales.....	578	Vesperal, The Roman (Jung).....	576
		Way of Salvation (St. Alphonsus Liguori)	765
		Westminster, The Cardinal Archbishop of.....	576

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—JANUARY, 1886.—No. 41.

CHURCH AND STATE—IN ENGLAND.

WILL the question of disestablishing the Church of England be brought into prominence in the present Parliament? Probably not. It will be just sufficiently "used" by the Radical party for the advancement of their own Radical repute; but the country is not ready, the time is not ripe, for such a sweeping, revolutionary measure. Yet, as the question has been already gravely mooted; much discussed both by Anglicans and Dissenters; and as Mr. Gladstone has said that he "foresees it to be one of the causes of angry strife in times to come;" it may be opportune—and it can hardly be uninteresting—to seek answers to the following five questions:

(1.) Politically, what are the bearings of disestablishment? (2) Financially, how does the matter stand in equity? (3) Sympathetically, how do Churchmen view the change? (4) Inimically, how do Dissenters view the change? (5) Is the whole scope, or balance, of the arguments in favor of the pruning knife or of the axe?

I.

Politically, it may be affirmed without misgiving, or without the least fear of sinning against charity, that the whole question will be viewed with reference to party interests, and without reference to (or with little care for) right or wrong. If this statement

VOL. XI.—I

seems too hard or too harsh, let us take Mr. Chamberlain's "attitude" at Glasgow, when discussing the disestablishment of the Scotch Kirk. He posed as a disestablisher pure and simple. He posed also as a disendower pure and simple. He argued that the vast endowments were originally intended for other purposes than those now approved; and, therefore, that, politically, religiously, morally, the endowments should be re-devoted to their first purposes. So far so good, and we can follow him. But now comes this "*volte-face* of principle": that forasmuch as disestablishment, if insisted on by Liberals, would create a trump-card of alarm for the Tory party, therefore this question, "under *all* the circumstances (the chief "circumstance" being the injury to the Liberal party) must not be made "an indispensable condition." This was certainly a confession of weak principle. It was suggestive of the attitude, "*dat ut dent*," or rather of *not* giving what might cost something. Yet here it must be noted that disestablishment in Scotland would be quite distinct from disestablishment in England; and we are only quoting Mr. Chamberlain as showing that party interests *may* take precedence (in certain cases) of right or wrong. Disestablishment in Scotland would be little more than a taking away what was given, two centuries ago, to the Kirk. The Presbyterian Kirk was a brand new Institution, which had *no* ancestry—doctrinally or politically—before Presbyterianism was invented; and it was by favor of Dutch William that it got possession of the funds which belonged previously to the Episcopal Church. In the eyes of all Anglicans, the Episcopal Church of Scotland is the more orthodox, the more "Catholic" Institution; so that the splendid present which was made by Dutch William to the Communion of the enthusiastic John Knox was, at the least, a spoliation of (truer) heirs. Very different is the case of the Church of England. Her endowments are mostly private benefactions; nor has the State created endowments for her at all. And, besides this, it must be remembered that the sums spent by English Churchmen, in the single matter of the education of the poor, relieve the State, and have always relieved it, of a vast annual burden on the Exchequer. There are, therefore, very considerable differences between the two rival Communions. Yet these differences do not seem to affect "principles." What Mr. Chamberlain pleaded in Scotland most Liberals would plead as gravely in England—in regard to the whole question of disestablishment: that the Tory party would make capital out of an election cry which should propose to lay hands on the National Church. Did not Mr. Gladstone seem to imply this in his manifesto? "I think it is obvious," he wrote, "that so vast a question cannot become practical until it shall have grown to the public mind by thorough

discussion." It is true that these words mean just nothing at all, so far as "religious principles" are concerned; but they do mean that, politically, it would be a very hazardous game to play—to attack an institution loved by Tories. What the "principles" of the Liberal party are, in regard to the whole subject, we may gather from the statements of Liberal organs. Out of about 580 Liberal candidates, more than 400 (say these organs) "are in favor of disestablishment on principle." And if we consult the "religious" organs of the Church party,—and the *Guardian* newspaper is perhaps their favorite organ,—we find that a number of "root and branch disestablishers" are undecided on the question of "opportunism." Now it is very amusing to find the *Guardian* trying to reconcile Liberal principles with the duty of supporting Church and State. All that it demands is, that the Liberals ought not, in the "next Parliament," to vote against the interests of the Church. "Your duty," says the *Guardian* to the Liberal voters, "takes you so far as refusing to vote for the anti-Church Liberal, but it takes you no farther. You are not bound to give your vote to the man who is pledged to support the Church if he chances to be a Conservative." So that we cannot be called hard or harsh, in the statement which we made at the beginning, that the whole question will be viewed with reference to party interests, and without reference to (or with little care for) right or wrong." If the most reputable of the Anglican organs—speaking, of course, Anglicanly—places political expediency above principle, secular Liberals (*a fortiori* secular Radicals) cannot be expected to be painfully conscientious.

Yet this question of "principle" is the more gravely important because it must affect many measures. Religious education, the marriage laws, and also socialism, *must* come before Parliament in the next five years. Now, if this "principle" is to be approved (and the *Guardian* newspaper clearly approves it), of being "a politician first, then a churchman," it will go hard with the religious interests of all these questions. No doubt a large number of members of Parliament are themselves absolutely indifferent on all such subjects; they are a sort of Gallios, who care for none of these things; or, if Liberals, they will adopt the politic principle, "*Amica veritas, magis amicus Gladstone*;" yet it is difficult to believe that political gentlemen of any school can actually vote for what, on principle, they think wrong. It is more likely that they will try to shift the bearings of the question, so as to make them *seem* to be more statistical than they are moral; and this will not be difficult to be done. It will only be necessary to talk glibly about the "abuses" of the present system, and about the "great saving" to the country through wiser uses. And at this point let us glance

at the financial aspect, so as to see how it may be made to look like "pure politics."

II.

First, we will take the amounts of church property. The endowments have been (ordinarily) computed to be of the value of two hundred millions sterling; the gross revenues, six millions; the income of the parochial clergy, four and a half millions. The bishops' incomes are about a hundred and fifty thousand. [The Archbishop of Canterbury has fifteen thousand; the Archbishop of York has ten thousand, and so has the Bishop of London.] The total annual value of the cathedral property may be put down as about three hundred and fifty thousand.

And now, to consider such facts relatively: When the census of religious worship was taken, in 1851, it was found that with a population in England and Wales of 17,927,609, the estimated total number of attendants at public worship on the census-Sunday was only 7,261,032. Of that number, 3,773,474 were present at the services of the Established Church, and 3,487,558 at the services of other religious bodies. In Wales, more than three-fourths of the service-attending population were found to be some sort of Non-conformists. And here it must be remarked in regard to Wales, that whereas the whole of the population a hundred and fifty years ago were professing members of the Anglican Establishment, at the present day fully eighty-four per cent. profess some sort of Protestant dissent.

And now, to say a word as to church buildings: It was stated in the census-returns of 1851, that out of a total of 14,077 churches, 9,667 had been built before the year 1807. How many were built before the time of Queen Elizabeth? was an inquiry that the Commissioners did not institute. But it is a notable fact that between 1801 and 1851, 4,410 churches were built; which shows that an immense proportion of existing (Anglican) churches must be acknowledged to be non-Catholic property. This is a very important item in the controversy, and somewhat simplifies the difficulties as to "justice;" for with the exception of the cathedrals, and a certain number of parish churches, the greater part of the Anglican church property never was Catholic in any sense. We are glad for the future Commissioners that this should be so; yet should disestablishment ever come to be worked out, the cost of compensation would be gigantic. Indeed, Mr. Gladstone has computed that between the incomes, private endowments, and the value of fabrics and advowsons, something like ninety million pounds sterling would have to be given, in the process of disestablishment, to the ministers, members, and patrons of the Church of England.

Finally, since mere statistics are not important, as much affecting "first principles in regard to justice," it may be said that the actual revenues of the Establishment (or, more accurately, the actual sums which she enjoys) are :

Archbishops and Bishops,	£ 158,000
Cathedrals,	350,000
Parochial Benefices,	4,500,000
Parliamentary and other grants,	100,000
Ecclesiastical Commission (net),	700,000
Queen Anne's Bounty (net),	130,000
Total,	<u>£ 5,938,000</u>

The financial argument, on the part of the disestablishers, may, therefore, be roughly put in this way: For about seven millions of so-called churchmen (many of whom do not profess any orthodoxy) there is an exclusive political forethought or recognition, and an endowment of about two hundred millions sterling; while the majority (considerably more than three-fourths, or not less than twenty-four millions of English subjects) are not established to the value of one penny. This is asserted by a large party to be unjust; yet, obviously, the question of financial justice would comprehend the most difficult inquiries, such as: Whence was the property first derived? Is its application such as was meant by the founder? How far does development in application negative prescriptive right to inheritance? Or: Can a precedent of three centuries totally obliterate Catholic right to possess at least Catholic foundations, just as in lay property it is allowed that long possession supersedes all earlier prescriptive rights? Such inquiries must be left to the law-judges, and to the learned in moral theology. It is more interesting at this time, and certainly it is more practical, to seek an answer to the more immediate question: "What do the members of the Church of England think or desire as to disestablishment?"

III.

The bishops and the wealthy dignitaries naturally take the same view; and five of the bishops have addressed pastorals to their clergy, urging them to rush to church defence. They have the best possible reasons for doing so. Primarily, there might be but little change to begin with, certainly not for the immediate generation; nor would there be any risk of "destitution." Social status would, however, be much jeopardized, because unquestionably to be a clergyman of a church over which the State throws a mantle of respectability is a different thing to being a clergyman of a church which would not be national (any more than one of the sects), but which must fall back on disputed claims for its supremacy.

High-Churchism might attribute status to the Anglican clergy, and Ritualism might demand homage from its votaries; but disestablishment and disendowment would mean: "Now take care of yourselves, and do not trust to the royal supremacy for your position." Every-one knows that the social status of the Anglican clergy has been, for three centuries, their chief power; that their inter-marrying with the higher classes has fixed their place; that the pleasant rectory or the rich canonry has loomed—in the near distance—before the vision of every candidate for holy orders. The clergy would scarcely be human if they did not appreciate the advantages which have accrued from an assured social respectability. And, therefore, it is but natural that they should regard with disfavor the cutting off of the element of worldly boons.

But there is another point which is even a good deal more disquieting; and that is: the equivocal character of "the Church" itself. If you take away the favoring accidents of prosperity,—the distinction, the prestige, of State-churchism,—you compel the Anglican Church to fall back on its own authority; and everyone knows that that is *nil*. Even the extreme Ritualists are aware that, spite of their assumption, the laity laugh slyly at their authority; that even the most admiring of their devotees have a good deal more than a suspicion that there is something wrong in "the Anglo-Catholic Church." So that, professing their own superiority to State aid,—their supernatural vocation and office,—they yet in private, in the fellowship of their intimates, admit that it is much safer to be established. And their knowledge of their own church history supports this view. They know perfectly well that what was "established" in the National church was Anglican doctrines, not endowments; that in 1534 an Act of Parliament "established" the doctrinal (or spiritual) supremacy of the sovereign, giving him "power to redress errors and heresies;" that in 1558 another Act made Queen Elizabeth the Pope of her own brand new Institution; that in 1559 another Act compelled all Englishmen (spite of the protest of the whole Anglican Hierarchy) to believe in an Elizabethan Christianity; that in 1571 the Thirty-nine Articles were established, just as "Common Prayer" was established a little later; and that the word "established" was first applied to the perfectly new Anglican doctrines, and only afterwards to temporal affairs. Knowing these truths, even the most advanced modern clergy hardly like to be cut away from their moorings. They are bound, in consistency, to affect to be indifferent to what the world profanely calls "loaves and fishes;" yet the affectation is confined to "published matter." In private chat they tell you frankly: "It would be a great pity,—unless it were to spite those wealthy dignitaries."

The laity do not take the subject much to heart ; that is, the great majority of them do not. There is, of course, a social, or say, connubial sense, in which the middle classes naturally feel interested ; because there is scarcely a family, among the middle classes, which is not allied by intermarriage with one or more clerical families. The "new curate" has always been an object of domestic interest to most of the single ladies in every parish ; and as marriage implies hopes of preferment, endowments are a very practical consideration. This view of disestablishment is but little discussed [the extreme Ritualists would resent any allusion to it, because they "do not approve of a married priesthood," theoretically], yet everyone knows that a married clergy implies, first, the means of getting married and keeping a family. It is, therefore, perfectly excusable, perfectly natural, to propose the painfully commercial inquiry : "Would the voluntary system *answer* in the Church of England ?" And the experience would, probably, be of this kind : for "popular" clergymen it *would* answer ; for "unpopular" clergymen it would *not*. So that popularity is not a reliable source of income. In former days popularity was everything for a clergyman—in the days when "sacerdotalism" was unknown. Indeed it may be said that the "success" of an Anglican curate used to depend mainly on his acceptability ; on the charm of his preaching or of his manners. There was weakness and there was force in this arrangement. Popularity was the bane of Protestant Anglicanism ; just as it was the one thing which sustained it.

That the bishops do not desire disestablishment, or that the wealthy dignitaries in all spheres do not desire it, we have assumed for a mere postulate of human nature. Few men who have a generous income would wish to exchange it for contributions. And here it may be noted that the very reason—at least, a principal reason—why dissenting ministers have been looked down upon by Anglicans, has been because they have been voluntarily supported. They have been alms-men ; not established, endowed gentlemen. True, dissenting ministers have not been "educated," until quite recently, when they have built their own colleges ; but the *tache* upon dissent has been the fact that it was not "recognized," not established, not endowed, by the Imperial Power. And at this point we may ask the question : What have the Dissenters got to say, as to the "justice" of the Establishment, or of its extinction ?

IV.

To summarize their arguments would take a volume. Let us be as brief as it is possible. The arguments may be classified under three heads : The Historic, the Doctrinal, the Ethical.

Historically, Dissenters say to the Establishmentarians : Your

Church was the creature of Henry VIII., of Edward VI., of Elizabeth, of Charles II. By persecution alone have you maintained your Church; while *we* have always fought for religious liberty. Witness the fruits of *our* labors (fruits wrung from you through generations of resistance): The Toleration Acts, the Test and Corporation Acts, the Marriage Act, the Abolition of Church Rates, and the throwing open of the Universities to all comers. *You* have created dissent all over the world. You compelled the Puritans to found "churches" in the United States; the Nonconformists to inaugurate Congregationalism; the Oxford Methodists to cover the land with their conventicles; Whitefield and Wesley to turn Dissenters. And as to your "Church," in the ecclesiastical sense, it was not of ecclesiastical origin at all; for, though it was, at one time, of regal, at another time of parliamentary and regal, it was *never* of ecclesiastical inception. "Church and State" is a most falsifying conjunction; it is a misnomer, which defies historic facts; for your Church was never more than the State's servile agent to carry out its political will. Thus, historically, we dismiss you as the most patent ecclesiastical sham which the history of all religions can furnish.

Doctrinally, we cannot treat you any better. As to your superficial "unity," you have (and you always have had) more divisions within your sect than there are without it: High Churchmen and Low Churchmen, Broad Churchmen and No Churchmen, and (of late years) Extreme Ritualists and Rationalists, contending against the Bishops *and* the Law Courts. Even your "principle" of Establishmentism is proved doctrinally to be nonsense; for, in Great Britain, you have two separate establishments, the Anglo Episcopal and the Scotch Presbyterian; nor can your Queen's chaplains (the chaplains of your only Pope) officiate lawfully in both communions. Indeed, as to doctrines, you simply have none at all; for every clergyman makes his belief for himself, while every bishop trims his sails to the State-winds; and as to the laity, it is simply impossible to find two of them, in any parish, who are in accord on all their religious opinions. You might as well call the "tuning up" of an orchestra—before the conductor has begun to wield his imperial baton—a harmonious and exquisitely-timed concert, as call the myriad eccentricities of Anglican opinion a uniform system of belief.

Ethically, you are, if possible, in a still worse plight. Your method of Church patronage is so gross a public scandal that Simon Magus might have patented it for his own. The Prime Minister appoints your Bishops and Deans (well, that perhaps is simply grotesque); your landowners give rich benefices to their kinsfolk, or sell them, like their garden-stuff, in the public markets; fully half of all your

"livings" are "saleable," and may come, and sometimes do come, under the hammer; and your *Ecclesiastical Gazette* has often "edified" your pious Churchman by "advertising" hundreds of livings for sale at one time—1497 in one advertisement! To take only two more specimens of your ethics: Your *idle* clergy have been always splendidly paid, and your *industrious* clergy left to live on bread and water; or, to quote one of your own clergymen (who was "suspended" for his sentiments): "The industrious, the ingenious, and the imaginative starve, while bloated mediocrity pants with success." And next, your High Church bishops, who pretend to be so "Catholic,"—and who are so shocked by being supposed to be "Erastian,"—when they receive their spiritual mission from the Sovereign make the following (profoundly "Catholic") declaration: "I do confess to hold the Bishopric of ———, as well the spiritualities and temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty, and of the Imperial crown of your Majesty's realm." These examples may suffice to vindicate the accusation we bring against you, of being, ethically, as utterly unworthy of being "established" as you have been proved to be historically and doctrinally.

V.

We pass, now, from these arguments for disestablishment to the arguments which are in favor of establishment; such arguments as are urged by various parties, not necessarily either Anglican or Dissenting.

(1.) It is urged by these apologists, that the constitution of the Church—its political and quasi-national character—is "a safeguard against the encroachments of Romanism;" so that, if the Church were disestablished, Roman Catholicity would easily triumph over the multitudinous sects of English Protestantism. This pleading gathers force (in the estimate of those who urge it) from the fact that "sacerdotalism" would necessarily be advantaged by the removal of political influences from Anglicanism; and thus the Roman Catholic Church would have no strong foe to contend with in urging its "superior pretensions."

(2.) The Act of Settlement provides, that the king (or queen) shall not be professedly a Roman Catholic; but, to disestablish the Church would be to declare that the sovereign was no longer its supreme spiritual head, because Church and State would be separated. And this would endanger the national Protestantism.

(3.) The "ideal" of the Church is the national profession of belief; so that to denationalize the Church would aid democratic socialism, if, indeed, it did not prosper positive atheism. The whole freethinking element of the British population would glory in the humiliation of an institution which, whatever its faults,

is a bulwark against impiety—in the form, that is, of overt, blatant atheism.

(4.) There would be a narrowing or sectarianizing of the Church of England, by its subjection to Anglican Canon Law; whereas, the principle of Nationalism may be allowed to be enlarging, or, at least, to prevent one party getting the upper hand.

(5.) Disendowment (which would accompany disestablishment to some degree, which must be correlatively decided) would bear hardly on a large number of poor districts, which would be unable to adopt the voluntary principle. Conversely, disendowment would *not* benefit the poor, for the tithes would be collected into the exchequer, and thus the wealthier classes alone would be the gainers. At present, on the contrary, the payment of the tithe reverts to the poorer classes in most parishes; who moreover have nothing to pay for “ministrations.”

(6.) The Cathedrals would have no lawful masters, and would probably lose their “ideal” as Church centres; for it is not unlikely that the question of their appropriation would be “fought over” by all Protestant parties. And even assuming that some newly constituted corporation should take the question of appropriation into their keeping, what wranglings, what unseemly squabbles, would be generated in the effort of each party to press its claims.

(7.) The State Church costs *nothing* to the nation. This is true, both because the nation is not taxed for it, and because the nation receives from it great benefits. But what would a Free Church cost the nation, if the nation cared enough about it to maintain it?

(8.) The *free gifts* of church members to the State-Church amount yearly to something like five millions; such gifts being expended on schools, church societies, charities, foreign missions, expenses of divine worship, and building or restoring of Anglican edifices. So that the active sympathy of Anglicans with their own communion, though it would not justify the experiment of voluntarism, at least shows that disestablishment is a hue-and-cry of party-advocates, not a profoundly felt desire of English Christians.

(9.) Scandals or abuses affect no *principle*. Let it be admitted that if you take the total net yearly value of endowments (received by all the officers of the establishment) you find that each clergyman *would* receive, on the average, three pounds ten shillings a week; *would* receive it, that is, but for the glaring inequalities which unhappily deface the present system; still, such inequalities might be easily lessened—might be, indeed, quite obliterated. Recast, if you like, the whole establishment; make it a more equitable institution; ensure a sufficient salary to all clergymen by lopping the huge endowments of a few clergymen; and be as

radical as you like with the dignitaries, to the benefit of the hard-working curates. Go back even, if you will, to a primitive simplicity, to an apostolic poverty and asceticism, and thus test the vocations of the clergymen. [This suggestion, however, must be unpractical so long as the Anglican clergy get married.]

(10.) Finally, let it be advanced that disestablishment and disendowment are both, in a true sense, impossible, because the Church of England never has been established by the State, neither has it ever been endowed. [No State document exists on either point.] The Church's own members, individually, have bit by bit built the sanctuaries of the Church; so that the State has no "ownership" in church property; nor has it legal or moral right to even pretend to deal, authoritatively, with what is in reality trust property.

VI.

We have thus sketched a sort of impression of the general "talk" which falls on the ear all over England; for, in a huge subject, presenting a score of different aspects, it is rather the fragments of personal views which find expression, than a clear, commanding synopsis of "first principles." Indeed it may be asked, and without the least fear of levity, are there any first principles in the matter? Is it not rather from *want* of principles—from national decadence in (professed) religious earnestness—that some millions of Englishmen have come to look with indifference on the spoliation of (what is to them) a Mother Church? That a vast number of Englishmen are shocked at the spoliation is no set-off against the fact that a vaster number still regard the whole movement without dismay. Even Mr. Gladstone, who is quite a typical "good Anglican," professes himself stirred only by expediency. He contemplates, with a profound composure and serenity, what the Bishop of Carlisle calls "rank robbery." No man sees the "difficulties" more clearly than he does, but no man makes less of "first principles." And if this be the attitude of Mr. Gladstone—who reads the Lessons in Hawarden Church on Sunday morning—how can we expect that the Radicals, or even the Liberals, will be restrained by an extreme delicacy of conscience? The truth is that the reaction from High Churchism, *plus* the reaction from Catholicity [the reaction, that is from a once earnest disposition to study the claims of Catholic truth], have left Englishmen simply wearied with *all* polemics, and asking only not to be "bored about controversy." A leading Protestant journal said recently: "What has come over the national spirit? Places of worship are, as a rule, not half full; strife, worldliness, prayerlessness, indifference, are almost everywhere the prominent features of Church life. . . . Nonconformist churches are but little better. Wesleyans, Baptists, Presbyterians,

Congregationalists, all tell the same story." And this is probably a truthful picture of the national coldness, and of the *cause* of the national attitude towards disestablishment, in all the sects, as well as within the national Church, and in all the political and social phases of English life.

Cardinal Newman has written recently, in an article in the *Contemporary*: "The world must be reckoned a worse enemy to religion now than at any time since Christianity came into being—because the world is better educated and informed than it ever was before." And though it would not be true to say that antagonism to the Establishment is any proof of society being more worldly, it is perfectly true to say that antagonism to *all* authority, and to *all* institutions which seem to favor it, is that growing disposition which is inimical to "Church and State," because the State lends dogmatic force to the Church. It must be borne in mind that a Protestant and a Catholic take a totally different view of the whole subject. A Catholic, of course, regards the Anglican establishment as, from first to last, only a political "accident;" or as the result of certain regal immoralities which, at the time of the Reformation, "changed religion." A Protestant thinks that Protestantism is "all right"; and, thinking so, has no idea of the divine, infallible teaching which *ought* to control the State and society. With him, therefore, it is no question of the gross and patent absurdity of a temporal power teaching religion to a spiritual power [he does not believe in a teaching spiritual power], but only a question of the State giving its support to the institution which represents dogmatic Protestantism. Now, so long as the whole country believed in dogmatic Protestantism, there was sense in the union of Church and State; but now that half the country disbelieves in it, while a large minority have given their hearts to dogmatic Ritualism, "Church and State" is an offence to the unbelievers, and an impediment to the freedom of the Ritualists. We trace, therefore, in this anti-establishment aggression the development of two perfectly distinct evils: the one (which is the greater) national faithlessness; the other a sectarian aping of Catholicity. This last evil is so final as to heresy that we may dwell on it for a very few moments in connection with the divorce of Church and State.

All changes which have taken place in English Protestantism, since the time when Queen Elizabeth first nationalized it, have led up, naturally and necessarily, to this final Anglican fallacy: the assumption of Catholic privileges by Protestants. We say "have led up to it naturally and necessarily." All Protestantism having been "found wanting," both intellectually and spiritually, it was "necessary" to do one of two things: Protestants must either become Catholics or they must discover (a) Catholicity in Prot-

estantism. Hence Ritualism! Catholics see the hollowness of the subterfuge; but doubtless many Ritualists do not see it. Now, "Church and State," when the Church meant "No Popery," and when the State meant "We will see that you don't have it," was a convenient and perfectly reasonable alliance; but "Church and State," when the Church means, "We *like* Popery, though a Popery *minus* any Pope but ourselves;" and when the State means, "You shall *not* have your Popery, and we will prosecute you in our law courts if you adopt it," is an anomaly more distasteful even to the Ritualists than it is to the skeptics or the indifferentists. Hence the Anglican clergy who, in the old Protestant times, would have besought the State to protect them against Popery, are now divided into these two sects of apologists: they who say, "We are Catholic priests, and we do not want your interference, and won't have it;" and they who say, "We rather like your loaves and fishes; our only complaint is, you do not drive out those Ritualists." To either sect the *raison d'être* is insufficient. And when we add the mighty masses of indifferentists [skepticism infects one-half of the population], it is no marvel that the aggressiveness of the root-and-branch men is more powerful than the apologeticness of the pruning men.

To a Catholic, it would be a cause for deep regret, if the Church of England were to be obliterated out of the nation; because it has filled, and even still fills, an awful gap in the national mind—a gap which no other sect can fill. The Church of England has been a bulwark for three centuries against the oppressiveness of the worst forms of skepticism. It has done an immense deal of what may be called social good; conferring happiness or religious repose upon millions of the English poor, and also holding together the middle classes in fellowship. Moreover, the noblest advocates of the Christian religion, the most learned and grave apologists for the Christian faith, have been found in the ranks of the Anglican clergy—not in the ranks of Nonconformists; and, though, necessarily, their splendid works have been imperfect, it would be ungrateful to fail to acknowledge their vast merits. True, the days are gone, and gone forever, when the stiff-backed, old-fashioned Anglican clergy were the doctors of orthodoxy to the whole nation; but let it be asked: Who can take their place in time to come? The Dissenters cannot do it; the Ritualists are but grave comedians; there is no powerful Evangelical party in the kingdom; the Church of England, disestablished, would shrivel into an historic sect, honored solely for its grave past, its remembered names; it would not be, in future, a national monument to historic faith—a national protest against the wickedness of *no* religion: the severance of Church and State would be the destruction of the idea that the State ought

to profess, at least, Christianity. To the minds of the masses it would mean this. You cannot degrade a rich man to a poor estate, without implying that you do not care to honor that rich man; and, to disendow the National Church would certainly mean, "there are *better* uses,—nay, even, there are more *religious* uses,—for all ecclesiastical property than is the present Anglican use." And this would be to degrade the national religion. It is an instinct of the human mind to render homage; and when a "church" has no claim to infallibility, it must put forth, at least, credentials to respectability; so that, if the State say to the Church, "Now, go about your business; and, as to your properties, we will discuss their uses in our civil parliament," it is only a natural, human conclusion that the once-honored Fallible Church has been weighed in the balance, and found wanting.

Very briefly, to summarize what has been said:

(1.) Politically, disestablishment is of party-interest, and Radicalism loves to pull down Tory strongholds.

(2.) Financially, the splendid properties of the Church are a fine bait to offer Radical constituencies, who, knowing little, and caring little, about equity, are easily lured to "return" demagogues who promise spoil.

(3.) No clerical party desires disestablishment, unless it be some few extreme Ritualists; while the Anglican laity would dislike it, both on traditional and fiscal grounds, save only such laity as are really Freethinkers.

(4.) Dissenters abuse the establishment "all round," politically, doctrinally, and ethically; but this is probably more from a sense of being humiliated, than from an intellectual or a religious repugnance.

(5.) The "world"—that is, all who do not care for religion, yet who have a respect for all decorous institutions—rather favor than disfavor the Establishment, and they do so on such pleas as are suggested by common sense, with just a touch of (traditional) homage for propriety. They urge that the Establishment is a good bulwark against license; that a Protestant sovereign is a guarantee of national liberties; that revolution, when really urged by anti-Christianism, is baneful to the national dignity and repose; that disendowment would pecuniarily injure the poor, and not really benefit any class; that the cathedrals and the grander churches are splendid monuments of a Constitutionalism, of which no extreme party should make havoc; that a State Church probably costs less than a Free Church; that education benefits largely by the parish system; that existing scandals could be utterly removed by the Legislature, much more easily than a New Church could be constituted; and, finally, that neither disestablishment nor disendow-

ment is, practically, within the sphere of political power, because the Church "has taken three centuries to be built up," and it would be impossible to respect the rights of its living heirs.

In the presence of all such reasoning, our conclusion is that the Church of England will be "let alone" for many sessions—many parliaments; or that, though the pruning-knife may be used pretty freely, the axe will not be laid to the roots. Revolution is not characteristic of the English mind; it is the game of the charlatan, the demagogue. No change could be more profoundly revolutionary than the defacing or effacing of the National Church, which represents (to the English mind) not only religious stability, but the very foundations of Constitutionalism. In Ireland, there was simply the case of a Catholic country which was overridden by a Protestant hierarchy—a monstrous and a patent anomaly. In England, it is really a case of a national Ecclesiasticism (less a Church than an assertion of Church principles), which gives the freest possible scope to every variety of opinions which can be included within the idea, Christian Religion. This may be said to suit the English Protestant mind. It is perfectly true that the growth in the two extremes—Freethinking and Ritualistic Pretension—has altered the relations of Church and State, has affected both their prerogatives and their mutuality, has even created an antagonism in principle which did not exist fifty years ago. All the more reason why what is *left* of national protest against the sweeping infidelity of the age should be treasured with conservative ardor; since the more you give way, the more you will have to give way—equally in politics and in religion. This is, of course, the English conservative point of view. As Catholics, we might have a good deal to say; but we have rather pictured the English, national estimate. What we would *wish* for the English Religion is one thing; but, seeing what it is, we do not want the Herbert Spencers to do in the Church what the Bradlaughs are trying to do in the Parliament.

HOW IRELAND HAS KEPT THE FAITH SINCE
CROMWELL'S TIME.

THE outburst of Puritan fanaticism which culminated in the despotism of Cromwell was only an episode in the history of English Protestantism. That system of belief is as essentially a political institution as was the old worship of pagan Rome. The politicians who established it cared little for religious truth, but much for political expediency, and political expediency had been their reason for changing the religious faith of the English people. A large section of the people had been unable to comprehend the motives of their rulers, and had carried their newly-made creed to lengths wholly beyond the designs of its makers. A generation of fanaticism had proved quite enough for the English people, and, on the death of Cromwell the former order of Church and State was restored in a torrent of popular enthusiasm. During a generation the term "fanatic" was an epithet of the deepest contumely in the English tongue. For in the latter part of the seventeenth century Cromwell and his assistants were regarded in England very much as Guiteau is now by the American people. The Puritan *régime* was denounced as a compound of dishonesty and cant, and the courtiers of Charles II. lost no opportunity of expressing their contemptuous hatred of the fallen Puritans. The Restoration of 1660, however, brought only a slight respite to the persecution of the Catholics in Ireland. The Government of Charles II. regarded a state religion as an important department of the administration, and the persistent refusal of the Irish Catholics to conform their creed to the orders of Parliament seemed to them little short of overt rebellion. The Cromwellian conquest had to a great extent identified English Protestantism with Puritanism in Ireland, and, as Puritans and Catholics were alike distasteful to their English rulers, some respite was naturally given to the latter there. A price was no longer set on the heads of priests, nor were the towns swept of their Catholic inhabitants, as under Cromwell, but, in other respects, the profession of the Catholic faith remained under the ban of the law. It might be connived at, but it could not be openly tolerated by the men who controlled the government. In many respects, the condition of the Church in Ireland under Charles II. resembled that of the German Catholics during the full rigor of the May laws, four years ago. The private belief of Catholics was but slightly troubled, but the organization of the Church was jealously forbidden. The rulers of England under the Restoration had little concern themselves about any system of religious

belief, but they looked on religion as a valuable political engine, the control of which they desired to retain in their own hands. Catholic bishops were especially distasteful, and, during the first eight years of Charles II., only one, the Bishop of Meath, was permitted to re-enter the country, and that privately, under the protection of powerful relatives. The whole Catholic population of three provinces, and of the more fertile portion of Connaught, had been stripped of all property in the land, and reduced to the deepest poverty. Schools and colleges had been all swept away, and their establishment was strictly forbidden, except under the direction of the Protestant clergy. It is needless to say that all public provision for the support of Catholic worship had disappeared, and that the churches throughout the land were in possession of the Protestant ministers, or in ruins. A formal abjuration of the Faith was a necessary condition for obtaining public office from the Crown, and might, at any time, be legally demanded of any one prominent in public affairs. Temporal rewards for formal apostasy were held out to the Catholic people of Ireland in the depths of the misery in which they had been plunged by confiscation, famine, and war. The Duke of Ormond, who had abandoned the creed of his parents, was among the foremost men of the Court, and was enriched by enormous grants of land and money, while Catholic families of equal rank were refused even an opportunity of proving their titles to their own property. The cultivators of the soil had the same temptation held out to them in a different way. Wherever Protestant tenants could be had, the fertile lands were assigned to them, while the Catholics were obliged to extract a precarious livelihood from the mountain sides and bogs. The traces of this system are visible to-day. Throughout Ulster, the rich valleys are almost invariably in the possession of Presbyterian or Episcopalian farmers whose ancestors were established in them over two centuries ago, with a specially favorable tenure, known until lately as the Ulster Tenant Right, while the mountains are almost as invariably peopled by Catholics, whose ancestors forfeited their lands rather than their Faith. The necessary condition for obtaining a share in the rich lands that had been handed over to foreign proprietors was apostasy, and that condition was steadily refused, though the scourge of famine came more than once to remind the Catholics what were the consequences of their refusal. In 1673 more than five hundred Catholics died of starvation in the single archdiocese of Armagh, and the archbishop, Dr. Plunket, wrote that he was only too glad to have enough of oaten bread to support life, and a thatched cabin to reside in. The poverty of the unfortunate population was aggravated by the extortions levied by the Protestant clergy. Fines were claimed for baptisms, marriages and funerals,

from the obdurate Papists, besides the regular tithes of their fields and flocks. When the victims attempted resistance, they were charged with non-attendance at the State worship, and crushed by arbitrary fines at the discretion of the local magistrates, or Protestant bishops who enjoyed judicial as well as clerical functions. When it is remembered that four generations have had to endure life under a system like this, and yet that Ireland is as Catholic to-day as two hundred years ago, we can appreciate the wisdom of the statesmen who have, in late years, undertaken to root out Catholic belief in Germany, Switzerland and France.

The maintenance of the Catholic Church in any country requires the existence not only of priests, but of the regularly organized hierarchy. In Ireland, under Charles II., the parochial clergy were but comparatively undisturbed, or only by such vexations as were common to them with the members of their flocks. The Government jealously prohibited, as a rule, the exercise of any episcopal functions, and hoped thus that the supply of priests would gradually fail, through the action of time and the stop of ordinations. In some dioceses confirmation was not administered during forty or fifty years, and others had been left entirely without bishops during an even longer period. The old Bishop of Kilmore, who alone had been able to baffle the pursuit of Cromwell's police, was utterly broken down in health, and, during the first eight years of the Restoration, Dr. Plunket, of Meath, was the only bishop capable of exercising functions in the whole island. In 1668 the Holy See appointed archbishops to the vacant sees of Dublin, Cashel and Tuam, and also a Bishop of Ossory; but so jealous was the English Government of the arrival of Catholic bishops, that it was thought prudent to have them consecrated in private, and at a distance from Rome. They slipped into their dioceses, one by one, without attracting much attention, and quietly commenced the work of reorganizing the Irish Church. The following year, Oliver Plunket was consecrated Primate of Armagh, with closed doors, in a private chapel in Brussels, and, a few months later, he too, found his way back to Ireland. So reduced in resources were the Irish Catholics that the four archbishops, with as many bishops, were deemed an ample episcopate for the thirty-six dioceses of Ireland. Even that number could hardly be supported by the impoverished people. The revenues of the Primate never exceeded three hundred dollars a year, and he described himself as much wealthier than most of his brethren. The Bishop of Kildare's usual income was only seventy-five dollars, and not a single prelate except the Primate ventured to keep a house of his own. As a general rule they lived as visitors in the house of some relative or other member of their flock, and exercised their functions as best

they could in private houses, and often in the shade of the woods, or the caves of the mountains. At times, the protection of some friendly official or territorial magnate enabled them to appear with comparative freedom, and such precious moments were eagerly profited by to administer confirmation, or to ordain priests. Thus, on one occasion, the Protestant Bishop of Derry forbade any interference with the Catholic Primate in his diocese, and allowed him to confirm in public. A similar protection was afforded him by Lord Charlemont, and even the Viceroy Berkeley showed himself friendly to the Primate personally. The latter even ventured to hold a Synod at Dublin, in 1670, though, a few months previously orders had been issued for his arrest, in case he should be found in Ireland. But such instances of toleration were intermittent, and liable to be followed by outbursts of persecution. The Archbishop of Tuam was arrested, three or four years after his arrival in Ireland, on a charge of exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction contrary to law, and, after imprisonment, was sent into exile. In 1673, all the bishops had to hide, and the letters of Dr. Plunket give a vivid idea of their condition at this time. In company with the Archbishop of Cashel he found refuge in a thatched cabin in the mountains, where "they could see the stars through the roof, and were well refreshed by every rain." They were happy to have enough of oatmeal porridge and milk and oaten bread for their support, and had taken the precaution to carry some books and a supply of candles with them, to resume their studies in their retreat, until an affection of the eyes, brought on by exposure, left the Primate incapable of reading or writing. This outbreak of persecution lasted over a year, and only then could the archbishops venture back to their ordinary residences. Experiences of this kind were of common occurrence in the life of Irish ecclesiastics during the seventeenth century, and it is suggestive that they had no effect in thinning the number of candidates that still continued to offer themselves for the Mission. The Bishop of Meath ordained over two hundred and fifty priests to supply the vacancies made by the Cromwellian persecution, and in 1676 there were nearly three hundred secular priests in Ulster alone, apart from the friars and Jesuits.

It was not enough, however, that men should be found to face the risks of persecution to recruit the priesthood. A certain amount of school training is indispensably required as a preparation for the Catholic priesthood, and on no point has the policy of the English Government been more consistent in Ireland than in keeping control of the schools. From the days of Elizabeth it had been a special offence for any Catholic to give instruction in Ireland, either to his own coreligionists or to others, and the law was

strictly maintained under the restored monarchy of Charles. Primary schools at that time were unthought of, and Trinity College, an essentially Protestant corporation, had practical control of all higher education. A certain amount of such education, however, was a matter of necessity to the Irish Catholics if they were to preserve the Faith permanently, and hence the system of hedge schools arose which for several generations kept up, however rudely, the cause of free education in Ireland. During the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth centuries the great majority of the Irish secular priesthood received their education in the clandestine hedge schools. In a visitation of the diocese of Raphoe in 1677, it is so stated, that of fourteen priests only one had ever been outside his native diocese, and the report adds that "they had learned superficially grammar and poetry," *i.e.*, Latin, and, after the manner of the country, some cases of conscience." A knowledge of Latin, at least sufficient to read it, and enough of moral theology to solve the ordinary cases of conscience, were the course required for the Irish priesthood in the seventeenth century, and even that could only be attained with the greatest labor. It was not that the Catholics of the persecuted land were indifferent to knowledge, but that its pursuit was legally barred to them, and it was only by stealth that they could venture to hand down the elements of knowledge from generation to generation. In the recent work of a Russian Nihilist, Stepniak's "*Russia under the Czars*," the author gives what he regards as a fearful instance of governmental cruelty. He tells how a party of students had been deported to a remote frontier town, and kept under police surveillance while allowed personal freedom. To beguile the monotony they organized a class for mutual instruction, but after a while the suspicions of the chief of police were aroused, and he summarily forbade the continuance of the lectures. To the indignant Russian such inhumanity seemed too gross to be believed, and he quotes it as an instance of the barbarian nature of Russian despotism. The rule of the Russian police captain was, however, for nearly three hundred years the exact system publicly carried out by the English Government in Ireland.

The colleges for the education of Irish priests, which had been founded in different parts of Catholic Europe, must be reckoned among the means by which the Faith was kept alive during the long centuries of the Penal Laws. The number of priests they actually supplied, however, was a very small one. The Irish College at Rome, founded by Cardinal Ludovisi, maintained and educated eight students, those of Salamanca, Santiago, Lisbon, and Alcala about six or seven each, and that of Bordeaux something over twenty. These were the chief colleges from which the Irish

clergy could draw recruits ; but the various religious orders, Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians, had also numerous Irish students in their houses on the continent. The main body of the clergy had to be content with whatever instruction it could find at home, and some touching accounts remain of the efforts made by the persecuted people to secure for themselves a higher education. Dr. Plunket, the martyr Primate, retrenched his plain food and wore no cloth but frieze, for the purpose of supporting three Jesuits as teachers in the academy which he established in Drogheda in 1670, during a period of unusual toleration. One of the professors was employed in teaching theology, his pupils being all priests who had no previous opportunities of instruction beyond those afforded by the elementary Latin schools during the reign of Cromwell. The fact that in a single diocese no less than fifty ordained priests were thus enrolled as students, shows to what straits the Church had been brought in Ireland. The other professors taught the usual classic course to about two hundred boys, nearly a quarter being Protestants of good families. It was only with the utmost difficulty that the school could be supported, as the bulk of the pupils were incapable of contributing anything to the maintenance of their teachers. Even this modest establishment, however, was not suffered to exist beyond three years, when an edict of the Government suppressed it, and compelled the Primate himself to take refuge in the mountains of his diocese to escape arrest. A similar fate befell a Catholic school which had been set up near Dublin, and Catholics were even forbidden to reside in the latter city unless they had been already established there. The Government was fully resolved that if it could not Protestantize its Catholic subjects, at least it could make them ignorant of human learning, and during a long century this policy was rigorously carried out.

While prohibiting the exercise of Catholic worship, the Government of Charles neglected no opportunity of raising divisions among the Catholics. It is significant of the nature of the warfare against Catholicity that, while the Government professed to regard the doctrines of the Church with abhorrence, it was always ready to support any priest who might revolt against his superiors. In Derry a priest named O'Mulderig had been named Vicar Apostolic, but was subsequently deposed for various crimes. Though still professing himself a Catholic, he did not hesitate to call the Government to maintain him in his position as a Catholic prelate, and the required aid was at once given him by the arrest of the priest appointed to take his place. At the beginning of the reign of Charles, a Franciscan, Peter Walsh, who had adopted Jansenist views, attempted to make himself the representative of the whole

Irish Church, and under the protection of Ormond convened a meeting of the Catholic nobles at Dublin, when a declaration of faith was drawn up in language offensive to the Holy See. Though disowned by the bishops, Walsh gathered some adherents, who were at once taken under the patronage of the viceroy, much as the Old Catholics were taken up by Prince Bismarck a few years ago. The Valesians, as Walsh's adherents were styled, were allowed to open churches and convents, while the Catholics were debarred from any public exercise of their worship. The craft of the viceroy, however, was all in vain. The attempted schism died out, and Walsh himself made his submission after a few years. It even proved of benefit to the Church, for the chapels which had been opened for the expected schism were not interfered with afterwards; and thus their use was accorded unintentionally to the Catholics.

Judged by purely human reasons, the prospects of the Church in Ireland in the reign of Charles were well-nigh hopeless. The greater part of the land and nearly all political power had been taken away from the Catholics. A large and compact minority of English and Scotch settlers controlled the Government, and were supported by the whole power of England. The clergy were under the ban of the law, and the means of filling up the gaps in its ranks were cut off as far as the power of the Government could reach. The connivance of some years was interchanged for the violent persecution of others. In 1674 all the bishops but one had to fly to the woods, and six years later, when the Popish Plot frenzy seized the English people, its effect was felt in Ireland. The Archbishop of Dublin was confined for two years in a cell in Dublin Castle until death released him, and the Primate, Oliver Plunket, after twelve years of unceasing toils, was executed as a traitor at Tyburn on the evidence of some infamous characters. His blood was, indeed, the last actually shed for the Faith in Ireland, but for a whole century longer the fidelity of its people continued to be tried by the inflictions of the Penal Laws.

Dreary as was the lot of the Irish Catholics under Charles, yet drearier times were to come. The accession of a Catholic to the throne in the person of James II. brought a gleam of hope to the downtrodden nation; and when that unfortunate monarch was driven from England by the Dutch army and the treachery of his ministers, the vision of an independent Ireland seemed for a moment on the point of being realized. A representative Parliament of the whole nation, Catholics as well as others, held sway in Dublin. Full toleration for all was proclaimed in the Catholic Parliament of Ireland, as it had been half a century earlier in Catholic Maryland; and the independence of the Irish Parliament itself of all

English supremacy was declared at the same time. The work of reorganizing the nation was pushed on with activity, if not always with judgment, by the Viceroy Talbot, and the popular hopes were raised to the highest for the future of their country. But those bright hopes were short-lived. The hastily raised levies were over-matched by the veterans of William, fifty thousand of whom were sent to the conquest of Ireland, and after a gallant contest of two years the remnant of the Irish forces capitulated on honorable terms at Limerick. Their forces were still formidable, and as William was anxious to bring the contest to a speedy termination, so full toleration was accorded by solemn treaty to the Catholic population, and the army was offered its choice of entering the service of the conqueror or of following the fortunes of his dethroned predecessor. Fourteen thousand of the flower of the nation accepted the latter alternative, and sailed away from their native land forever. Scarcely had they departed when the terms of the treaty were broken, and the whole power of the Government once more was set to work to root out the Catholic Faith from the soil of Ireland.

The toleration promised by the Treaty of Limerick was refused by Parliament, and the Penal Code against all exercise of Catholic worship replaced on the Statute Book. All Catholic bishops, dignitaries and religious were ordered to depart the kingdom forthwith, and a few years later the same rule was applied to all priests whomsoever who had not been registered. A limited number were allowed to remain on condition of making their names and residences known to the authorities and taking the oath of allegiance, but it was expressly provided that this regulation should be only temporary, and that no successors should be allowed to take the place of the registered priests as they were removed by death or other causes from their parishes. As the presence of Catholic bishops in Ireland was utterly forbidden, no exercise of Church discipline was allowed, and any registered priest, if so disposed, might refuse to conform to any rule of his superiors with impunity. Their registration was, besides, no protection against the vexations of the magistracy. The latter might require them at any time to take an oath of abjuration of the Pope's temporal supremacy which, in the opinion of the Protestant judges, was not incompatible with the Catholic belief, but which was received in a very different light by the Catholics themselves. The registered parish priest of Macroom was thus committed to jail in 1712, and his case was not a solitary one. In the County Leitrim alone, about 1714, the grand jury found presentments against no less than thirty-one priests and two schoolmasters, but they mournfully added that not one could be captured in spite of the large rewards offered for each.

In Sligo and in Waterford, during the years 1712 and 1714, numbers of Catholics were compelled to swear where they had last heard mass and who had officiated, but the attempt to secure the persons of the hunted clergy was as unsuccessful as the presentments of the Leitrim grand jury. In other cases, however, the chase was more successful. In Cork, Fathers Hennessy and Carty were convicted of being priests and transported beyond the seas in the summer of 1712, and Father Boyle, in Galway, and Father Hamal, in Down, were arrested and held for trial the same year. Two Catholic teachers were also reported as being in Longford jail under conviction for "having been Popish schoolmasters." Two more were under sentence for the same crime in Dublin in 1715, and a curious letter bearing date of the beginning of 1713 is preserved in the Irish archives from the cousin of Secretary Dawson, a resident of Armagh, which sets forth that he had a few months before arrested Brian McGurk, the Popish Dean of that place, and had obtained witnesses against him, but that his prisoner died before the assizes, and he hoped that this mischance would not deprive him of the reward of fifty pounds which he would have been entitled to on conviction. Another letter states that Father McGurk was ninety years of age, bedridden and in second childhood at the time of his arrest, facts which must enhance our sympathy with Mr. Dawson's disappointment at his thus being cheated of his legal right. It is a striking fact to find the Protestant Primate Boulter reporting to the Irish House of Commons, in 1732, that there were over fourteen hundred secular priests and two hundred and fifty friars at that time in Ireland, and nine communities of nuns and five hundred and forty-nine Popish schools were maintained in full defiance of the law. The worthy Primate, an Englishman and a bitter fanatic after the manner of the times when fanaticism was little beyond a hatred of the Catholic Church, complained at the same time of the difficulty he found in obtaining eight hundred ministers for the State Church, in spite of the immense revenues and power at its disposal. Again, as in the old days of Rome, the persecutors had to confess their powerlessness before the passive resistance of Christian faith.

Though the priests were specially the object of pursuit, it must not be supposed that the simple Catholics were left unmolested in the practice of their religion. It was impossible to imprison or banish an entire nation, and the attempts to compel attendance at the State churches had proved utter failures; but still, there were ample means of making Irish Catholics feel the power of the law whose peculiar creed they so obstinately refused to profess. From all share in public affairs they were absolutely excluded. No Catholic could be a member of Parliament, or of any municipality; they

might not vote, nor sit on juries if objected to; the courts were closed to them, and their testimony might be refused on the grounds of their religion. Against personal outrages they had, practically, no legal redress, and the remnant of landed property, that a few still retained, was at the mercy of any Protestant claimant. The law provided that any member of a Catholic family might claim its property absolutely by becoming a member of the State church, thus offering a premium to the disregard of filial affection or subordination. The learned professions were closed to all who refused to swear to the royal supremacy, and Catholics were forbidden by statute from educating their children, either at home or abroad. The tenant-farmers, who had no lands to lose, were not beyond the reach of the Code, which combined the brutality of a Roman tyrant with the jealousy of an English huckster. Catholics might not take leases for over thirty-one years, and in case any farmer was able to extract from his holding anything above *one-third of the rent*, his right in it was declared forfeited, and any Protestant might oust him from its possession. The fact that any Protestant might take a horse belonging to a Catholic on payment of five pounds, has been widely commented on as an instance of the severity of the Penal Code, but it is not so generally known that the right to possess horses at all was one of the first relaxations of the Penal Code, by which arms and horses were alike forbidden property to any of the proscribed faith.

The trading and manufacturing classes fell equally under the restrictions of the Penal Code. Catholics were not allowed to invest money in real estate, or even to lend it on real estate security; they might not be received into many trades, and in all they were forbidden to receive apprentices beyond one or two each, and they might not own houses or even reside in many of the principal towns. Galway and Limerick were among the cities in which Catholics were forbidden to dwell, except under special conditions, and in Bandon, Enniskillen, and Belturbet, down to the middle of the century, no Catholic was allowed to live on any pretext. In Limerick it was found impossible to eject the whole population, but down to 1744 no Catholic chapel was allowed within its walls. In Galway, which had long been the second city of Ireland, the whole Catholic population was expelled in 1708, and again in 1715, with a few exceptions. The freedom of all corporations throughout the country was expressly reserved to the Protestant citizens, and the civic property was, in almost every instance, shamelessly jobbed away to members of the same creed. Among the Catholic Irish no class was too insignificant to escape legal persecution. The fishermen of Folkestone petitioned Parliament, in 1698, to redress the injury done to them "by the Irish catching herrings at Waterford

and Wexford and sending them to the Straits, thereby forestalling the petitioners' market;" and a few years later, the Protestant porters of Dublin solemnly laid before a sympathizing Parliament the grievous wrongs they suffered at the hands of one Darby Ryan, a papist merchant, who presumed to give employ to porters of his own creed.

The family relations among the poorest Catholics did not escape the malevolence of the law. The right of becoming guardians to minors was denied to all members of the proscribed faith; and in the case of Catholic minor heirs, the Chancellor at once seized their persons and had them brought up as Protestants. In this way the Duke of Ormond in the reign of Charles, the celebrated Earl of Inchiquin, and the Marquis of Antrim in the beginning of the eighteenth century, were removed from their families and forced into a profession of the State belief. It was impossible to apply such a rule to the children of the poor, universally, but the Government, during the whole of the century, made constant efforts to put it in practice partially. The poverty of the bulk of the population, resulting from their exclusion from all profitable employments, was described as a crime by the very legislation which forbade them from acquiring property. In Dublin, in 1703, a society was empowered to arrest all *idle vagrants, i. e.*, unemployed poor, found in the streets, and to keep them at hard labor in the workhouse prison for a term of seven years. All children over five years found begging might be at once seized and kept in the workhouse until their sixteenth year, after which they were to be bound out to any Protestant who wished to use their labor, for five years in the case of girls, and eight in that of boys. An act of 1715 extended the power of carrying off the children of the destitute Catholics to the minister and churchwardens of every parish throughout the country, provided the consent of a justice of the peace was obtained. A corporation, similar to the Dublin Institution, was established in Cork, in 1735, and it was enacted that the captive children should be interchanged between the two cities to separate them more effectually from their parents. The well-known Charter-schools, founded by the Protestant Primate Boulter, in 1732, were another effort in the same direction, though more in the shape of a bribe for the surrender of poor Catholic children than the other Acts. These, the only primary schools of the country, offered to feed and clothe any Catholic children between six and ten that their parents would give up, on condition that they should be reared Protestants. Once received, the children were not allowed to see their parents, or hold intercourse with any members of their families, and their withdrawal was prohibited by law. The charter-schools were maintained long after

the relaxation of the penal laws, by the public funds, and only were abandoned in 1825. The treatment of the unfortunate children within these, and the foundling hospitals in Cork and Dublin, was marked by a refinement of anti-Catholic brutality which cannot be paralleled, we believe, elsewhere in the history of mankind. Howard, the philanthropist, in 1788, declared that their state "was so deplorable as to disgrace Protestantism and to encourage Popery in Ireland." The children were employed in the fields for eight hours a day, at the earliest possible age, and the bulk of them were sickly, naked, and half-starved. Their masters, however, were careful to provide them with meat or broth, at least once a week, and Friday was the day chosen the better to wean them from Popish practices. The unfortunate children thus violently separated from family, friends, and every friendly association, often retained their adherence to the rules of the Church, and broth was forcibly poured down their throats as a means of reclaiming them from Popery. Among all the brutalities of the Penal Code we must confess that the treatment of these hapless infants appeals most forcibly to our sympathies, and excites the profoundest scorn for the ruffian agents of the persecuting State.

To properly appreciate the force of the law thus directed against the family relations, it must be remembered that the penal laws had succeeded in reducing the great bulk of the Irish Catholics to the lowest poverty. Famines were of periodical occurrence, and no provision whatever was made for the support of the Catholic poor at any time. The trade guilds and asylums were for Protestants exclusively, and for the same class alone were occasional relief measures voted by Parliament. For the Catholic poor there was no succor except the charity of those scarcely better off than themselves; and so, at every season of dearth, the ghastly scenes of the last great famine in 1848 were of common occurrence. Boulter himself, in 1727, declares that "thousands of families had quitted their habitations the year before to seek for bread, and many hundreds perished;" and Swift, in the same year, and in 1729, tells a similar story. The taxable families, in the County of Kerry alone, diminished from fourteen to nine thousand between 1733 and 1744. The famine of 1741 was equally severe with that of 1848, and a pamphlet of that time speaks of the dead as lying in numbers along the roads, and the living as feeding on docks and nettles. Whole villages were depopled in the rich Golden Vale of Limerick by mere want, and a Protestant minister in Monaghan, Skelton, declared that whole thousands had perished in a single barony, and the dead had been eaten in the fields by dogs for want of people to bury them. It was in the midst of scenes such as these that the Charter Schools were founded to offer bread to the

starving Catholics in exchange for their children's souls. But even then, the appeal was made in vain ; and at no time, even with the powers of the law for seizing children by force, did the inmates of these institutions rise to a total of two thousand among a Catholic population of millions.

That a system such as the Charter Schools should be described as a work of mercy, may seem incredible, but such was actually the title given to it by its founders, and the Parliament which so long maintained it. In their words, at least, it was simply a benevolent attempt to relieve the miseries of the poor, and the breaking up of family ties and the abuse of the hapless children themselves were only small details, in no way detracting from its general character. Even in our own days, the system has found a eulogist in the well-known English writer Froude, and one is puzzled to know whether the constant system of misrepresentation of all things Catholic which for two centuries has been almost a creed in English literature, really produces an inability to distinguish between truth and falsehood ; or, whether the writer in question regards history as an unscrupulous lawyer does a case entrusted to his pleading. The trick of giving false names to acts of oppression is an old one in the annals of Irish misgovernment. The politicians who devised and carried out the Irish Penal Code, steadily styled themselves the maintainers of civil and religious liberty. The usurper who, in breach of his solemn faith, sanctioned its commencement, was universally styled the "pious, glorious, and immortal deliverer" of the Irish people, in the language of the dominant faction, and the bulk of the people were styled, in viceregal speeches and acts of Parliament, as the common enemy of the nation. Even the execution of the anti-Catholic laws was often given the name of repression of vulgar crime. During an outbreak of agrarian violence in Connaught, in 1713, eight priests were flung into Roscommon jail, not as Catholic priests, but as accomplices of the disturbers, though no evidence whatever was offered of their connection with their acts. Like the "suspects," of recent years, they were "hostages, not criminals," but the magistrates preferred to give them the latter name, as it made the bitterness of the law more bitter by its infamy. The pilgrimages of the country people to the ancient shrines, which no violence of persecution could prevent, were frequently described as "riotous assemblies," and broken up by armed force during the recital of their devotions. But perhaps the most grotesque instance of the systematic blackening of the characters of the victims of religious persecution is that given by a Tipperary Grand Jury in 1750. A Father Hely had attended the bedside of a dying Protestant to receive him into the Church. The act alone was a capital offence

under the Penal Code, and the priest naturally did not appear for trial, whereupon he was outlawed. The act charged was the attempted conversion of a Protestant, but with the scrupulous regard for truth characteristic of the warfare against Catholicity, he was "proclaimed in the usual form, as a Tory, robber, and rapparee, of the Popish religion, in arms and on his keeping."

Such was the nature of the war waged during almost a full century by the whole power of England against the existence of the Catholic Church in Ireland. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, an impoverished population of less than a million (eight hundred thousand was the estimate of Archbishop King in 1703) was pitted against the full power of the fast-growing British Empire, and, twenty-nine years after its close, the Empire had to confess its utter failure by the Emancipation Act. Indeed, by the laws of human affairs, it was inevitable that the Irish people, reduced to abject want, deprived of leaders, of political organization, of the means of education, and of all open communion with the Head of the Church, should cease to be Catholic in a couple of generations. Such was the view of a man like Swift, at the beginning of the penal laws, and such is the view of all who forget that the hand of God is mightier than the policy of man. In 1732, a rough census estimated the numbers of the Irish Catholics at one million three hundred thousand, and the Protestants at seven hundred thousand, but a century later the numbers were found to be six and a half millions to one and a half millions. Through the long agony of the penal laws less than five thousand Catholics were found to deny their faith, as the Convert-Roll in the Irish Record office attests. All through the same time, the reports of the Bishops of the Established Church bewail the falling away to "Popery" of their own adherents. "Instead of converting those that are adults," wrote Primate Boulter, in the full rigor of the perfected penal code, "we are daily losing several of our meaner people who go off to Popery;" and, in Galway, in 1747, Colonel Eyre complained that "of late years several old Protestants, and the children of such, had been perverted to the Popish religion by the indefatigable assiduity, diligence, and the uncontrolled access Popish ecclesiastics had to the town." When the Royal College of Maynooth was founded for Catholic education in 1795, the last descendant of the Protestant Archbishop Ussher was one of its professors.

The freebooters of Elizabeth, the Calvinist colonists of James, the fanatic soldiers of Cromwell, and the greedy adventurers of William, had each, in turn, come to root out the Catholic Faith in Ireland, and, in the workings of Providence, the progeny of each has gone to swell the ranks of its adherents.

It is now over three hundred years ago since the Government of England first decreed that the Catholic Church should have no existence in Ireland, and, during by much the greater part of that time all its power was bent to the object of its extirpation. Two generations after Elizabeth had passed to her account, the whole power of Puritan fanaticism was turned anew to the same end. The restored monarchy of the Stuarts continued the task and sent the head of the Irish Church to die as a felon at Tyburn. The Dutch usurper and his successors during an entire century labored at the same task by all the means which the perverse ingenuity of man could devise, backed by an unlimited power over the lives, property, and good name of all who dared oppose its will; yet their work has passed away already. A few thousands are now found to profess themselves of the Independent sect which ruled supreme under Cromwell. The Church of Elizabeth, of James, and of the Georges, has, in our own days, been swept away as a useless plant that cumbered the earth in vain, while the Faith preached to the wild Celtic clans by the exile Patrick, fourteen hundred years ago, while a Cæsar yet held sway in Rome, is still to-day the living faith of the Irish race. We cannot conclude better, perhaps, than in the lines of the Catholic poet:

“The Celtic Cross raise over me,
Let the ivy 'round it twine;
'Twill tell to the land that bore me
That the Ancient Faith was mine;
And though fallen and poor I found it,
All trampled, and low, and lone,
Yet my heart grew the closer around it,
Like the ivy around that stone.”

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VISITATION NUNS IN
THE WEST.

THE growth of religious orders, in newly-settled countries, is naturally attended by hardship and adventure ; and the experiences of the Order of the Visitation in this country are far from being an exception to the rule. Some of these experiences are more or less tragical, some are amusing, and nearly all are interesting, not only in themselves, but on account of the fortitude, patience, and tact with which they have been met by the Sisterhood. Yet the interest they excite, arising from the combination of small incidents rather than the isolation of great ones, does not in the main absorb or thrill ; it may be likened, on the contrary, to the quiet charm of those tapestry figures which satisfy the eye without fixing the attention. If they do not lose even this mild interest in our hands, we shall be fortunate ; for we propose to exemplify these experiences by sketching the rise of a single house of the Order, upon which, happily, its early adversities, like winds sweeping over some majestic palm, have had no other effect, on the whole, than to strengthen its foundations, and perfect its symmetry. But, first, a word of religious orders in general, and of the Order of the Visitation in particular.

A religious life may be broadly defined as living in obedience to God ; and, subject to the supreme direction of the Church, the object of every religious order, active, contemplative, or mixed, is, primarily, to secure this obedience in its members, and, secondarily, to promote the welfare, spiritual and temporal, of others, although, in the contemplative orders the recognition of the latter aspect is relatively vague and faint. This secondary feature of the common object is realized in various modes—teaching, preaching, relieving the poor, nursing the sick, consoling the afflicted, raising the fallen, upholding the light of example—all of which have come down unchanged from the earlier orders ; but, with respect to the primary feature, the later orders pursue a method different from that of the earlier, which consisted chiefly in the mortification of the body by long vigils, extreme fasts, and exposure to other physical sufferings more direct and acute. This method, not inadequate to the rude times in which it prevailed or the gross yet simple temptations at which it was pointed, gradually lost its adequacy with the growing refinement of men and the increasing complexity of their besetting temptations. Sooner or later, therefore, it was destined to undergo a change ; and the change came with the Society of Jesus, which, under the inspiration of its sagacious founder, insti-

tuted a new method, consisting in the mortification of the will, rather than of the body, whereby the stream of conduct, so to speak, might be purified in its source—the very citadel of the soul possessed and manned against besieging temptations. And this method—suited to temptations the subtlest as well as the simplest, to constitutions the most delicate no less than the most robust, and equally to every stage and phase of advancing civilization—distinguishes more or less conspicuously all religious orders since founded. But perhaps it has never arrayed itself in a more amiable and captivating form than in the Order of the Visitation of our Lady the most glorious Virgin Mary, founded, in the dawn of the seventeenth century, by Francis de Sales and Jane Frances de Chantal, who breathed into it the sweet and lofty spirit that still animates it, and which makes it to-day, as two centuries ago, a star of purest lustre in the religious firmament.

The founders of this Order were both of high birth, Francis de Sales having been the eldest son of the Count of Sales, one of the principal nobles of Savoy, while Madam de Chantal, married at an early age to the Baron de Chantal, a nobleman of Burgundy, was the daughter of Benigne Fremyot, President of the Parliament of Dijon, and an illustrious member of one of the best families of the *noblesse de la robe*; and both also were endowed with singular gentleness of character, clearness of intellect, and strength of will, the works of Francis de Sales, whereof the "Introduction to a Devout Life" and the "Love of God" are the chief, sufficiently attesting his rare intellectual endowments, and the letters of Madame de Chantal, in freshness, vigor, and grace, rivalling those of Madame de Sévigné herself, who, by the way, was her granddaughter. The married life of Madame de Chantal, remarkably serene and happy, was suddenly terminated by the accidental death of her husband; and, in the shadow of her great bereavement, she not unnaturally turned, with redoubled zeal, to devotional exercises, of which, however, she had never been unmindful. During the third year of her widowhood, in the world yet not of it, and yearning ardently for a religious life, she first met Francis de Sales, then Bishop of Geneva, who became her spiritual director, and eventually, having satisfied himself of her vocation, unfolded to her the project, already matured in his mind, of establishing a congregation of the Visitation; which she at once joyfully welcomed, and, despite some formidable obstacles, successfully coöperated with him in founding, becoming herself the first superior of the first convent of the new Order. In due time both were canonized; and it may be said that the institution they founded, as it had mirrored the spirit of their lives, caught up and has steadily reflected the light they shed from the altars of the Church: in it they still live.

The Order of the Visitation, as befits its origin, fulfils the two-fold intention of religious orders in a way notably gentle and at the same time complete, blending harmoniously the rigors of monastic discipline with the charities and amenities of the highest refinement. The Order was especially designed to open a religious field to ladies whose delicate rearing and feeble constitutions unfitted them for the life of the more austere orders. As originally conceived by its founders, indeed, it resembled the Institute of the Oratory, the members not being cloistered, and taking the simple vows only, thereby retaining the liberty of returning to the world, if dispensed by their lawful superior; and in this form it was actually opened at Annécý in Savoy on the 6th of June, 1610. But, in compliance with the urgent representations of the Archbishop of Lyons, Francis de Sales yielded his original conception, and eight years later, accordingly, in virtue of a bull of Pope St. Pius V., the institute was erected into a regular monastic Order, with enclosure and under the solemn vows. It was thus finally planted in the strong subsoil of the Church; and seldom has a cloistered stem borne so fair a flower or rich a fruit. Nor has its growth been less noticeable than its fruitage. Before the death of Francis de Sales, the mother-house at Annécý had put forth branches in the principal cities of France; and, within fifty years after his death, the number of convents of the Order had increased to more than, one hundred. They now, we need not say, flourish in all quarters of both hemispheres.

It was not till the beginning of the present century, however, that the Order of the Visitation was introduced into this country, the first foundation having been opened at that period in Georgetown, D. C., by Bishop Neale, then coadjutor to Archbishop Carroll, first Archbishop of Baltimore; though the foundation was not settled till 1816, when Bishop Neale had succeeded Archbishop Carroll; and, at his instance, supported by a statement of the facts, Pope Pius VII. formally admitted the young community to the rank and privileges of a religious house. The progress of the Visitation in the Old World had been comparatively easy sailing; but no sooner was the Order launched in the New World than difficulties arose, not so much from the roughness of the waters, to pursue the figure, as from their trackless expanse, with the lack of suitable vessels, experienced crews, and the requisite sailing directions. The house at Georgetown, to drop metaphor, was opened with only three Sisters, natives of Ireland, at whose head was Miss Alice Lalor, who subsequently became the first Superior. Miss Lalor, known in religion as Sister Teresa, was born at Tenakil, Mountrath, Queen's County, Ireland, and was first cousin to Mr.

Patrick Lalor, formerly Member of Parliament for Queen's County, in which post he was succeeded by his son, Mr. Richard Lalor, who now fills it. Neither she nor the good Bishop knew the rules of the Order; and their school was held in a little frame building near the house of some Poor Clares, who, coming to this country from France a few years before, had sought to establish a convent of their Order in Georgetown, and with whom the Sisters of the Visitation, by the advice of the Bishop, took up their temporary abode. Among the books, however, belonging to these Poor Clares, strange to say, was found a volume containing the rules and constitutions of the Visitation Order, which the Bishop straightway translated; and one difficulty of the community was mastered. In a few months, the Superior of the Poor Clares died, and the remaining members returned to France, when the Bishop, alert on behalf of his foundation, purchased their property, and the Visitation Sisters occupied their house as a convent, still using the little frame building as an academy; and one other difficulty was at least mitigated. They had now tolerable vessels, and full sailing directions; but their crew remained scant and inexperienced. To supply this deficiency, Bishop Neale applied to the Order in Europe for some of its trained members; but none came. Another matter of solicitude on the part of the new community was the proper costume of the Order, of which they were ignorant; and the Bishop, though for years he anxiously scrutinized every package of devotional objects sent to the American mission, could find no book or picture that enlightened them respecting this point, until at length, on taking out one day the contents of a large box, his eyes met a handsome lithograph of St. Jane de Chantal herself, and the point was cleared up; although the poor nuns, it is said, could afford, after all, to furnish only Mother Teresa with a habit in fulfilment of the rule. Of the simple vows they had made, that of poverty was, indeed, easily kept; necessity alone would have exacted its observance. From this condition they soon emerged, without, however, the protection of the founder, who did not live to witness the triumph of his cherished community.

Archbishop Neale died in 1817, less than a year after the Papal recognition of his foundation, which he committed, by one of his last official acts, to the charge of Father J. P. Clorivière, a descendant of an honored house of Brittany, a soldier decorated by his sovereign with the Order of St. Louis, and a priest of marked ability, varied accomplishments, and unswerving fidelity. Under his direction, and that of his successors, aided by lights in the Sisterhood, the Mother Convent of the Visitation in this country, entering on a career of prosperity unchecked, if not unshadowed, realized at last the ideal of its founder, the three Sisters sheltered

in the house of the Poor Clares multiplying into a populous and far-famed convent, and the humble school in the rude annex developing into one of the most complete and renowned seminaries in the land. The weak craft, with scant crew and no supplies, that we saw struggling out of port, if we may recur to the nautical figure, was in the course of the voyage transformed into a palatial ship, which, richly equipped and nobly served, now rides at anchor in the harbor of its destination.

It was not to the mother convent, however, that we referred in the opening of this article, but to one of the fairest and most vigorous of its offspring—the Visitation Convent of St. Louis. The St. Louis foundation was first planted at Kaskaskia, Illinois, a flourishing town before St. Louis could boast of a name, and once the capital of the State, as well as the centre of civilization in the West, but now, through a tragic succession of flood, earthquake, tornado, and pestilence, reduced to a hamlet, containing less than thirty families, and without sight or sound of commerce; a complexion, indeed, to which it had already come, though still trailing faint clouds of traditionary glory, when the founders of the new community arrived there fifty years ago. Kaskaskia, it should be premised, was in the diocese of Bishop Rosati, of St. Louis. The journey of the colony thither, it would seem, arose from a formal application by the Bishop, who, in his letters to the mother convent, had left the impression not only that accommodations had been provided at Kaskaskia for the Sisters, but that the parish priest had resolved on surrendering to their use his own dwelling, insomuch that, on the eve of their departure, the Rev. William Matthews, Spiritual Father of the Convent, said jocosely to Mother Agnes, the head of the adventurous band: "If you have turned the priest out of his house already, I do not know what you will do after your arrival in Kaskaskia." The event, we regret to say, turned the good Father's pleasantry into somewhat bitter irony. With no misgiving of the event, however, the Sisters of the foundation, on the 17th of April, 1833, set out from Georgetown for the seat of their mission. We subjoin their names: Mother M. Agnes Brent, Superior; Sister M. Genevieve King, Assistant and Mistress of Novices; Sister M. Gonzaga Jones, Procuratrix, Dispenser, etc.; Sister M. Ambrosia Cooper, Sister M. Helen Flannigan, Directress of the School; Sister M. Isabella King, Teacher, Sacristan, Robier, etc.; Sister M. Josephine Barber, Postulant; Sister M. Catharine Rose Murray, Lay Sister, Cook, etc.

The Sisters travelled under the protection of the brother-in-law of Sister Genevieve King, Mr. Richard Queen, who in his marriage to Miss King, we may be pardoned for saying, showed that fate, like Shakespeare, is not above questionable punning. On reaching Balti-

more, they had the honor of dining with Archbishop Whitfield, and, after viewing his grounds, and visiting the Cathedral, Seminary, and other places of interest, drove to the Carmelite Sisters, who were in the act of celebrating the golden jubilee of one of their number, and by whom they were welcomed heartily and detained till the afternoon of the following day, when they resumed their journey, going from Baltimore to Frederick by horse-cars, which they saw then for the first time. At Frederick they were met by Father Virgil Barber, of the Society of Jesus, father of their postulant, and were introduced to Father McElroy, who died in the summer of 1877, aged ninety-five. The day afterwards, exchanging horse-cars for four-horse coaches, they began the ascent of the Alleghenies, which they crossed in four or five days; and, taking a steamboat at Wheeling, arrived in Louisville on the last day of the week, in time to go to confession to the saintly Bishop Flaget. The next morning they assisted at high mass in the Cathedral, and in the afternoon at Benediction, renewing their journey the following day, being accompanied through the locks of the Louisville and Portland Canal by Bishop Flaget, Mother Catherine, of the white cap Sisters of Charity, and Father Abel, the last of whom gave them a very doleful description of Kaskaskia, telling them they would "all die of pleurisy the first winter," which, adds the accomplished historiographer of the convent, "was not very far from the truth."

On the succeeding Friday, May 3d, being the anniversary of the Finding of the Holy Cross, the wayfaring Sisters reached the point at which they were to leave the Mississippi, the captain rousing them from their berths at three o'clock in the morning, and explaining that, as there were no means of accommodation or conveyance on the Illinois shore, he would put them out at St. Mary's landing, on the Missouri side; which ere long he did. Near the landing stood the residence of a Mrs. Davis, which they had been told was a tavern, and whither accordingly they bent their steps, Mr. Queen, with a freedom proper to the guest of an inn, proceeding forthwith to order breakfast for the party, which was duly served; though while at table their hostess, with becoming delicacy, let it be known that her house in fact was a private one, upon which Mr. Queen, finding his foot in the snare that Tony Lumpkin sets for Young Marlow in the play, extricated himself by a fitting apology, wherein the Sisters eagerly joined. The drama of their Western life thus opened with a comedy act. After breakfast Mr. Queen, constituting himself a committee of one to examine the prospect, crossed the broad Mississippi, and made his way to Kaskaskia, two or three miles distant; whence he returned after dinner, reporting that the arrival of the Sisters was unexpected by everybody, not excepting the parish priest, whose house actually was so dilapidated

as to be scarce habitable by himself, and that no accommodations had been provided for them, although conveyances, he said, were on the way to carry them to the town, which he described, with open contempt, as "a little, miserable, out-of-the-way place." On receiving this report, so contrary to what they had been led to expect, the Sisters were disheartened, and would have returned to Georgetown had it not been for Mother Agnes and Sister Gonzaga, who remained steadfast, though disappointed as keenly as the rest. In the course of the afternoon, rallying a little from their dejection, they went aboard a flatboat, and, seating themselves on their baggage, were ferried across the Mississippi, their feelings on the passage being divided between fright at the sinking of the heavily-laden boat almost to the water's edge (Sisters Helen, Isabella, Ambrosia, and Rose sitting speechless throughout), and astonishment at the caterpillars overspreading the river far and near, so that the boat had to plow its way through to the Illinois side, where, with increased astonishment, they saw the same insect carpeting the shore and clothing the trees. Here they found awaiting them three vehicles, in size and shape like the old-fashioned milk-wagon, but known as the Kaskaskia stage-coaches, with the parish priest, Father Condamine (their future confessor), in the foreground on horseback, under whose escort they were soon on the way to Kaskaskia, all straining their eyes to catch a distant view of the place, when anon, to their amazement, they were told they were in it, although it proved as impossible to catch a near view of it as a distant one. Look as they might, they failed to see the town; not, like Yankee Doodle, for the houses, but for lack of them. Thinking to localize it by deduction, they inquired for the church, and were pointed to a log structure, which they had taken, and insisted on taking, for a barn, telling their informant he must be at fault or jesting, and were still on the lookout for the town, when their coaches stopped in front of the stone mansion of Mr. Wm. Morrison, grandfather, by the bye, of the Mr. William Morrison now in Congress from Illinois, and official leader of the House of Representatives.

Wm. Morrison and Pierre Menard, both of whom figure prominently in the history of the Sisters at Kaskaskia, were the leading citizens of the town, and among the leading citizens of the State. Col. Menard, however, though of the town was not in it, his residence being on the opposite bank of the Kaskaskia or Okaw river. Mr. Morrison's house, memorable as the scene of Lafayette's reception in Kaskaskia a few years before, was the only real edifice in the place, the other houses being rude fabrics of clapboards or logs, chiefly of one story, and hidden from sight by forest trees, the whole disposed irregularly on either side of a single street, whose Sab-

bath quiet the sound of wheels scarce ever disturbed. Other streets there had been, when the town was populous and prosperous, but now these were only indicated by fences, while, in place of the houses that once lined them, lay gardens or pasture-fields. Of Kaskaskia even then it might be said, as Goldsmith sang of Sweet Auburn,

“ No busy steps the grass-grown footway tread,
But all the bloomy flush of life is fled.”

Yet the inhabitants, it should be added, although sparse, were for the most part select and well-educated, so that the Sisters, at least, could enjoy the favor which Milton implores of Urania,—“ fit audience find, though few.” Mrs. William Morrison and her sister-in-law, Mrs. Robert Morrison, the latter a convert, and a woman of unusual intelligence, received Mother Agnes and her companions with great cordiality; and Mr. Morrison, on learning the object of their mission, offered them hospitality until accommodations elsewhere could be provided for them, setting apart for their use the entire second story of his house, including a capacious ball-room, which, however, had been rendered slightly unsafe by an earthquake that left a fissure in the wall, though the Sisters used to walk there to recite their offices and other forms of devotion. Another vestige of the same earthquake was observable in the wavy lines of the parlor floor, into which it had been shaken out of its original plane. The next day, the gentle newcomers were visited by the *élite* of the village, and among others by Lawyer Baker, who, as they afterwards learned, was generally chosen by the townsfolk to test the qualifications of those presenting themselves as teachers in the place, and who, in this character, really not ostensibly, had a long interview with Sister Helen, the directress of the school, resulting in his thorough satisfaction, followed by a favorable report of her education and acquirements, although, had she known his object, her embarrassment might have occasioned a less effective display of both. This informal examiner, we should say in passing, was none other than he whose eventful and brilliant career, in the senate and the field, terminated more than a quarter of a century later on the bloody heights of Ball’s Bluff. The following day, being Sunday, the Sisters went to high mass, passing to and from the church through Mr. Morrison’s large and beautiful garden, which adjoined the Catholic graveyard at the back of the church, so that they could go to mass or visit the Blessed Sacrament without entering the street. Father Condamine, who preached in French, suitably referred to their presence in Kaskaskia, explaining the purpose of their coming, and enlarging on the benefit that would accrue to the children of the congregation from Catholic

training and instruction. Bishop Rosati, on whom perhaps more properly devolved this good office, was detained at St. Louis by the prevalence of the cholera, during which he thought fit not to leave the plague-stricken city, lest his absence should be imputed to a wrong motive. But the Sisters suffered no detriment from this manly sacrifice to duty. The good impression they had made on all they met soon spread to the community at large, and they felt themselves, socially speaking, in a friendly atmosphere. But evidently their fortitude and resources were not to be lightly taxed.

On Monday, they began to prepare their own house,—a store lent them free of rent by Colonel Pierre Menard, who had the counters and shelves taken down, intending to change it into convent shape, with conventual entrance and grate. Meantime, the carpenter made their altar and tabernacle, which they lined and trimmed handsomely. Having been told in Georgetown that they would not need a separate altar, they came entirely unprovided; but, in the course of a week, they got everything ready, and were able to move into their house, where mass was celebrated the second Sunday after their arrival. They also had Benediction in the afternoon, and the Sisters sang, Mrs. Robert Morrison and some other ladies being present and enchanted with the music; “for,” as the historiographer fondly explains, “our Sisters had very fine voices, and sang in two or three parts.” Father Condamine gave the Sisters mass four times a week, saying on Sundays two masses, one for them and one for the congregation. He also lent them a few vestments until they could obtain a supply. Donations of all kinds were now pouring in,—provisions, beds, blankets, culinary utensils, etc., not to mention a chair apiece, which, till benches could be made, they carried up and down, from the choir to the refectory, and thence to the assembly. The town could not boast of a market, although it had a butcher, without much custom, however, as nearly every family raised and killed its own beef and mutton, sharing any overplus with some one or two neighbors, who, in due course, reciprocated the favor. The Sisters, until settled, were well supplied by Mrs. William and Mrs. Robert Morrison, who lived just opposite, and constantly ministered to their comfort in a thousand ways, even sending them nearly every morning hot waffles or cakes for breakfast. The negro men and women of Mr. William Morrison and his brother Robert, then and thereafter, were always at the service of the Sisters when needed, making their academy fires in the winter, scrubbing, cutting and hauling wood, filling their canoe (the cistern or rain-barrel of the country) with water from the Kaskaskia River, whenever the clouds failed, and in general doing whatever there was occasion for. During the first winter, the Sisters bought no wood at all. The Morrisons

not only supplied the infant community with wood, but sent their negroes to cut it. Not a day passed that Mr. William Morrison did not go to the house of the Sisters, and walk around the premises, to see if anything was wanting. He gave them, at first, one cow, then two cows more, a sheep, hogs, chickens; and, doing nothing by halves, added the corn and hay to feed them. He also gave the Sisters a large stove for the children's refectory, and a comfortable Franklin, and, for their library, presented them with Lingard's "England," in six or eight volumes, the "British Poets," in twenty-four volumes, the "Old and New Testament," in some thirty volumes, and several other works; and, besides all this, made them a present of a piano and guitar, a number of nice desks, tables, and washstands, and about a dozen pairs of shoes. Colonel Menard was not less generous. Keeping in his employ a carpenter and a weaver, he had the former construct each of the Sisters a bedstead, with tester, and a table, and the latter make them sixteen pairs of woollen stockings, and as many pairs of cotton, two pairs of each apiece. He also gave their sacristy a fine resting-stand, and often brought them himself a basket of squabs, and, most important aid of all, attended to their business, in person or by agent, as to his own, and, when needed, became their financial backer.

The first contribution of this free-hearted patron, however, soon came to be of no avail, the store he had lent them gratis, and from which, for their sake, he had removed all the mercantile conveniences, proving too small for their purpose. They had, consequently, to look out for other quarters, which they shortly found in the old Kaskaskia Hotel, then standing vacant and open, with many of the window-lights out, the sashes decayed, and ruin showing its face nearly everywhere; yet, all things considered, promising better than any other building in their reach, and offered to them, moreover, as the store had been granted, free of rent. They moved into it about the 1st of June, having spent one week at Mr. Morrison's, and nigh three weeks in the quarters just vacated. Their first task was to repair and adapt the old hostel, in front of which the weatherbeaten sign-board, in its rickety frame, still swung and squeaked, as if bemoaning the happy days that were no more. This grim *laudator temporis acti* the Sisters had cut down at the outset. They next covered the lower frames of the mouldering windows, constrained thereto by want of means, with blind windows of solid wood, fastened by bolts or buttons, and removable at will; substituting, furthermore, blind panes for the missing lights in the upper frames, as they afterwards did for the lights knocked out by a hailstorm. Then, having snugly housed in the livery-stable their cows, hogs, and poultry, they converted the ball-room into a chapel, the piazza into a parlor, and the bar-room—its

counter and balustrade demolished—into a children's refectory, play-room, and class-room: when their first task, comprehending of course numerous details not mentioned here, was accomplished. Later in the summer, we should not omit to say, they turned the loft of the livery-stable into a carpenter's shop, for the use of a workman sent them by the Lazarists at the neighboring town of Perryville, who, in addition to their great spiritual assistance, contributed in this way to furnish the new house with desks, benches, tables, cupboards, and the like conveniences.

At length, the Sisters, by their own perseverance and the kindness of their western friends, found themselves installed in a building fairly commodious as well as fairly comfortable, and were in fair working order, much to the gratification of the good people of the town, and especially of the Morrisons and Menards, who immediately placed their daughters at the convent school. As Mr. William Morrison had four daughters, and Col. Menard, besides an only daughter, had a bevy of granddaughters and nieces whom he educated, and as these young ladies took nearly all the extras, their enrolment as pupils gave the new seminary a cheering start. In reality, it could not have started, nor could the Sisters have remained in Kaskaskia at all, but for the Morrisons and Menards, who followed up their own patronage by soliciting that of their friends in St. Louis and other places, with such effect that the Sisters, in a short time, had as many pupils as they could teach. Col. Menard's daughter wishing to take lessons on the harp, as well as the piano, and the Sisters having no harp, he purchased his daughter one, which he allowed the Sisters to use in the school, and finally gave them, completing the necessary variety of their collection. Veritable curiosities to the townsfolk were these instruments, particularly the piano, which no doubt had its share in spreading the interest felt in the nascent community; for when the Sisters came to Kaskaskia there was no piano in the place, and one had never been seen by many of the inhabitants, including the daughters of Mr. Morrison, save the eldest one, the consequence being that the convent piano quickly set the town agog, men, women, and children flocking to see and hear it, almost as if it were the magical pipe of the Pied Piper of Hamelin. The musical accomplishments of the Sisters, in truth, had no little to do with their early success in Kaskaskia, neither culture nor the appreciation of culture being necessary to the charms of music, which captivate even "the savage breast;" so that their foundation, like a temple more renowned, but the reverse of holy, may be said to have risen

"with the sound
Of dulcet symphonies and voices sweet,"

though not assuredly "like an exhalation." In time, the Sisters organized a choir, whose services, by request, they put at the disposal of the parish church for Christmas and Easter, their best piano (for they now had more than one) being conveyed through the town to serve instead of an organ, the melodeon in its present form not having been invented at that time. Miss Sophie Menard played on these occasions, and the youthful choir sang their best in several parts, to the great satisfaction of the congregation, as well as of Father Condamine, justifying the compliment of "Aunt Hagar," an ancient negress in the service of the convent, who, when asked if there had been high mass at the church, said, "Not only high mass, but *very* high mass." This old woman, I ought to mention, at first a Methodist, and very prejudiced, became a fervent convert, and literally gave herself to the community, telling all who made inquiries that she had "jined the Sisters." She lived to be over a hundred, a pattern of every virtue, and dying, as she had lived, most holily. During the summer Mrs. Robert Morrison, who, although she had been a Catholic for a year or two, had not been baptized in the Church, holding her Protestant baptism valid, experienced a change of mind on this point, under circumstances deemed miraculous by those cognizant of them, and received Catholic baptism, as did her husband soon afterwards, and many others, acquainted likewise with her extraordinary experience. Mr. William Morrison's wife and children, it may as well be stated here, all became Catholics, and he himself was baptized on his death-bed about four years later. The presence of the Visitation nuns in Kaskaskia seemed the signal for a revival of Christianity as well as of education.

Meanwhile, the number of boarders no less than of day-scholars had increased so rapidly that the Sisters were again crowded for room, and had to look about for supplementary accommodations, which offered themselves in an unoccupied house, owned by a Mr. Mather, at the far corner of the same square, and which they rented for fifty dollars a year. It was a dismal-looking place; but convenient for their purpose. They took possession of it in the fall; and, as it was some two hundred feet distant from the Old Hotel, and they were compelled to cross the square many times a day regardless of weather, Mr. Wm. Morrison, solicitous for their health, made between the two houses a double pathway of long thick logs, whereon they could pass to and fro dry-shod, and, whenever it was fine overhead, walk two abreast for exercise and recreation. Mather's house now became the convent, while the hotel formed the academy, and the ball-room, lately the chapel, was converted to a use more in keeping with its original one, becoming the children's play-room, class-room, study-hall, and danc-

ing-room. The change was convenient in every respect, though it did not relieve the sisters from the exercise of their abundant ingenuity in transformation. The new chapel in Mather's house adjoined the choir on one side and the children's apartment on another, the altar standing exactly opposite the choir door, which thrown open gave the Sisters a full view of the sanctuary, visible also from the children's apartment. The choir, during the summer, was used for prayer exclusively; but in the winter the Sisters had to make it their assembly-room, novitiate, confessional, and chapter-room. Here they kept a piano, which served for Benediction and for music lessons. In this room, too, the priest took his breakfast. Under the chapel and choir were very good cellars, which the Sisters used for the children's wardrobe, and next the chapel stood a large turkey-house, roughly weather-boarded, which in summer they turned to account as a refectory, abandoning it in winter, however, to the icy blasts. Among the trials of these high-souled and devoted women, indeed, not the least was the intense cold of winter in this region. And now winter was upon them.

In Mather's house they took their first Christmas dinner, to which they invited Madam Menard, and in compliment to her dispensed with silence. In common with her hosts, she keenly enjoyed the entertainment, and, like them, was only amused at the snow drizzling through the roof over the table, and, despite a high fire in the fire-place, forming here and there tiny piles. The innocent hilarity of the company was brightened rather than dashed by these playful sallies of Old Winter. All the same, however, they shortly afterwards had the roof repaired. A few days later, as if fate were in a mood for sporting with them, the refectorian, having brought over the dinner and set it before the fire to keep warm while she went back to the kitchen at the hotel for something else, saw on returning a large dog, with a piece of meat in his mouth, come out of the refectory door, ajar from congenital defect, and sheer off with their dinner, a mishap which left them to dine that day on bread and molasses. But none knew better than they how to make the best of worse hardships than this. Their equanimity seems to have been proof against every physical trial. Not bread frozen as hard as a stone, and cut with hatchets instead of knives, could subdue their invincible good humor; for by that crucial hardship it was not unfrequently assailed. Cleanliness, John Wesley said, is next to godliness; but we doubt if cheerfulness does not stand betwixt them.

Mather's house, as we have said, was now the convent proper, and here the community lived, lodged, and had its conventual exercises, enjoying great quiet and retirement—virtual cloister life; for, the parlors being in the academy, the world scarce intruded. Yet it is

with the world very much as Horace says of nature : you may put it out at the door, but it will steal back through the chinks and crannies. Certain it is that in the course of the winter the convent became the scene of a species of manifestations which have cut a considerable figure in the world. Strange noises were heard, especially in the night : firing of pistols, moving of furniture, heavy steps as of men ascending the stairs. One night a loud rap came on the mantel near Sister Isabella's bed, and at the same moment the light was blown out. Three or four Sisters slept in that apartment, and all heard the rap, and saw the light extinguished. " Even in the daytime we heard these noises," says Sister Josephine, the convent historiographer, then a young novice, and noted always for her fearlessness. " Once I was going upstairs, when the *Invisible*, in heavy silk-robcs, rustled close by me, and passed down. I turned my head, and gazed after the *passer-by* with all my might ; but nothing but the sound of the rustling silk was discernible. The foot-fall was noiseless ; and, though the robe seemed so close as to touch me, I felt and saw nothing." One evening during Compline the Sisters heard a heavy cannon-ball roll across the floor overhead, and then thump heavily down three steps. They raised their eyes, and exchanged glances, and Mother Agnes, looking at the Sister Infirmarian, signed to her to go up, for a sick Sister was in bed there. The Infirmarian found her patient trembling with fright. " Every night," Sister Josephine continues, " I used to hear a kind of clicking, an indescribable sound, something like the short chirp made by the turkey-hen. It seemed to be very near my pillow ; and occasionally something seemed to strike my pillow, like a heavy drop of water falling on it. I mentioned this in recreation, and Mother Agnes and the Sisters told me to speak, and ask, ' In the name of God, who are you ? and what do you want ? ' Night came, and with it my preternatural visitant, whom in a loud voice I interrogated according to orders ; but, receiving no answer, said, as Mother Agnes had told me, ' In the name of God, depart ! ' It gave one click, and I heard no more of it that night. The next day, in recreation, the Sisters were joking over what had passed. They had heard me speak in the night, and, supposing I was holding colloquy with the ghost, lay still as mice in their beds, fearing to stir. But on being informed that, although obedient to the word ' Depart ! ' the nocturnal visitant had not deigned to disclose the purport of his visit, they told me I had spoken too loud. ' You must speak in a whisper,' said they. Next night I spoke in whispers, but with as little success. Yet when I whispered, ' In the name of God, depart ! ' one click came, and there was no more of it. Every night my ghost came, and stood at my pillow as long as I chose to let him, ten, twenty, forty minutes, more or less, but instantly and invari-

ably obeyed at the words, 'In the name of God, depart!' I do not know whether our Sisters sleeping in the same and adjoining rooms made use of any such adjuration; but I know their health seemed seriously threatened from the consequences of fear and loss of sleep." Father Timon (afterwards Visitor of the Lazarists and Bishop of Buffalo), who resided hard by at a place called "The Barrens," used frequently to stop at the convent, in pursuance of his duty as extraordinary confessor, and to see that all was well. On the occasion of one of his calls Sister Josephine told him of these strange "voices of the night," which he at first treated lightly, saying it might be owing to the state of her blood. "But, Father," she said, "I am not at all afraid." "Even so," he replied, "it may be attributable to some physical, natural cause." She assured him that Mother Agnes and all the Sisters heard the sounds, and that all, except Mother Agnes and herself, were harassed with fear and want of rest. Then Father Timon, cutting the gordian knot, said: "My child, it is a good sign. If the devil got what he wanted, inwardly, he would not have recourse to such outward disturbance." The next morning Father Timon said mass—for they did not have mass daily, as there was only one priest in Kaskaskia—and took Holy Communion to the sick Sister who slept in one of the haunted chambers. "From that time forth," Sister Josephine concludes, "we never heard any noise in the house." We have taken the liberty to cite *verbatim* a part of Sister Josephine's testimony, not merely on account of the vivid force with which she gives it, but to authenticate the experiences for the sake of those, embracing at present representatives of all grades of intellect, who indulge in speculations concerning the cause of such phenomena. For the rest, it must be said that no seclusion, not the holiest or most inviolable, can avail to shut out the devil, or his senior partner in the triple firm named by the Litany. Paradise did not. Nor did Heaven itself. So our Sisters, although the world forgetting, were not by the world forgot; but it must be owned they came off very well. Other experiences not less remarkable and more edifying, we may say, marked the history of the community at Kaskaskia; but the relation of these does not fall within the scope of this paper.

About two years had now passed since the arrival of the Sisters in Kaskaskia; and their foundation, no longer an experiment, bid fair to stand. In view of the palmy future that seemed opening before them, they resolved to erect a building of their own; to which end Mother Agnes conferred with Bishop Rosati during one of his visits, who, accompanied by some others, went with her to see the proposed site, and, it appearing eligible, the ground was purchased, Col. P. Menard advancing the money. The next step was more difficult. The building was to be of brick; but neither

bricks nor bricklayers were to be found in Kaskaskia. In this strait the Sisters wrote to Mr. Wheeler, of Baltimore, son of the architect who built the convent in Georgetown in 1831, and he, in response to their appeal, went out west, and took charge of their enterprise. In conjunction with Col. Menard, he at once set up a brick-yard in Kaskaskia, solely to supply bricks for the building in hand, there being no other demand for them in the place, and two years or so elapsing, in point of fact, before the second kiln was burnt. For the work, owing to the scarcity of workmen, went on slowly, and often, owing to their absence altogether, came to a stand-still, in such wise that when Mother Agnes resigned her office in May, 1836, nearly a year after ground was broken, little more than the foundations had been laid. Under these circumstances, Mr. Wheeler, himself a carpenter, proposed to erect a frame building, at right angles to the foundations of brick, and on a line with their east end, his view being that the frame building, which, anyhow, would be needed as a convent, might be put up expeditiously, seeing that he could assist in the work on this structure, as well as overlook that on the other, and have the former, he assured them, ready for occupancy before the next autumn. This assurance he made good; and in the summer vacation of 1837, about the last of August, they bade good-bye to the old hotel and to Mather's house, and removed to their new habitation.

Sister Helen Flannigan was now the Superior. Up to this time the community had lost none of its original members, and the previous year had received from Georgetown an important accession in Sister Augustine Barber, Sister Josephine's mother, who brought with her a lay postulant with whom she had become acquainted in Cincinnati, and was followed a few months later by two other postulants from the same city. In Kaskaskia there seemed no such thing as a religious vocation. Of the ten Sisters professed in the eleven years at Kaskaskia, not one was a native or denizen of the place; nor was one of the postulants.

The house of which the Sisters now took possession was two stories high, one hundred and forty-two feet by twenty, and, with its fresh paint, green blinds, and piazzas fore and aft, "looked," Sister Josephine says, "like a long steamboat," a comparison that may or may not imply disparagement, for in those days, to a western eye, a steamboat was the flower of architectural beauty. At all events, the building was their own. But hardly had they got into it when the death of a postulant occurred, followed by the death of Sister Ambrosia Cooper, October 2d, and that of Sister Gonzaga Jones, December 3d. The sadness occasioned by these afflictions was not lightened by the absence at that time of a stationary pastor in Kaskaskia, Father Condamine having returned to Paris, and his

successor, Father Roux, to St. Louis, although once a week some priest, either Lazarist or secular, gave the Sisters mass and heard their confessions. At this period of depression they experienced great comfort in the presence of Bishop Bruté, who quite unexpectedly visited Kaskaskia, and remained with them several weeks, accepting, in default of a habitable parsonage, an apartment in their bake-house, where five or six little orphans lodged. Children and Sisters at this time, it should be borne in mind, were all crowded into one building, two or three children sleeping in each of the cells, while the play-room, besides, had to be turned into a dormitory at night. The Sisters, it will be observed, still had need of their skill in make-shifts; and, as usual, it stood them in good stead. At the south end of the east piazza they put up an awning, and, during the warm weather, used this as their refectory, exchanging it, when the weather grew cool, for one end of the kitchen. Their table consisted of two boards, tacked together, and supported on two barrels, one at each end. Mr. Wm. Morrison's black man, Reuben, was cook, and an excellent one, having served in this capacity on a steamboat. He was a man of tall stature, and always behaved with the utmost dignity and propriety, attending at his post quietly and promptly, without ever appearing flurried by super-numerary demands, and, when all were answered, standing with his hands behind his back, looking towards the reader, and listening with absorbing attention to "Rodriguez," or any other treatise on asceticism selected for the day; from which it was plain to see, if he did not understand the lesson, he perfectly understood the situation. After the Sisters had finished their meal, the children took theirs at the same table, there being no other. The chapel was at the end of the corridor, with the altar over the fire-place, and fronting the door looking down the passage. During mass the Sisters knelt in the cell-doors, and received communion at the chapel door, in which a chair was placed with a communion cloth across the back. The children went to mass on Sundays only, and knelt at the lower end of the passage and on the stairs. Into this temporary chapel Bishop Bruté, during his visit, used to steal, and pass hours before the Blessed Sacrament. The Sisters often met him, his breviary under his arm, going along in silence and on tiptoe, without raising his eyes, or stopping to speak to any one.

The permanent chapel, the reader must know, was assigned to the brick building, on which, as soon as the plastering in the frame building was done, the masons had got to work once more, and worked this time so diligently that it was roofed-in the same fall, enabling the carpenters in the course of the winter to finish the interior, which, in the following spring, was plastered and painted,

when the whole establishment at last was completed. Meantime, the Sisters were anxious to get into their permanent chapel before Christmas, and the workmen, willing to gratify them, made haste to lay the floor and lath the west end, the other walls being of brick. Plastering, though, was not to be thought of in winter, and the Sisters had to hang up quilts and other coverings to keep out the wind and cold, from which the flooring overhead also helped in some measure to protect them. As fire was indispensable, and there were no bricklayers at hand, Sister Josephine was given the job of laying the hearth. "First filling up the cavity with sand," she says, "I put down the bricks in regular files, to the admiration of all who saw it, and to the joy of those who feared we would freeze there on Christmas night." Yet, on that occasion, in spite of her handiwork, and the roaring fire it supported, the chapel was fearfully cold; and not on that occasion only. For a considerable part of the months of January and February they were obliged to move the altar up close to the fire, and even then to keep the cruets on the hearth until needed at the altar, when the Sister Sacristan put them in reach of the priest; a chafing-dish, withal, was kept on the altar. The convent itself, nominally finished, and wherein all were still packed, was in fact no more weather-proof than the half-finished chapel in the unfinished academy. Framed of unseasoned timbers, and weather-boarded without filling the interspaces, the shrinking of the lumber made wide gaps and crevices, through which the freezing winds swept unchecked. Many of these openings the Sisters stuffed up with tow; but, in rooms where this precaution was not taken, their feet ached with the cold. The music teachers were compelled to keep, under the pianos on which they gave lessons, boxes lined with buffalo skins, in which to wrap the feet. Nearly all the Sisters who had cloaks wore them throughout the day, or at least in the early hours of the morning—at meditation, mass, and the office. Several were obliged to make hoods and wear them. Sister Catherine Rose one day called them to look at pans on the fire, frozen on one side and stewing on the other. A number of empty cups and pitchers broke from the cold alone. "I, myself," Sister Josephine attests, "in attending a writing class, with two large fires in the room, one in the chimney-place and one in the stove, saw the ink freezing in the children's pens, and felt as if my feet would freeze off from the wind gushing under the washboards." On some of the most intensely cold days, they had to suspend school, for it was as much as the children could do to keep themselves warm hugging around the fire. The Sisters did not attempt to keep water in their cells, as the pitchers would have burst. A lay sister carried some around to each cell, or else a bucketful was placed before the fire in the assembly-room on the

same floor, whither the Sisters went half dressed to perform their ablutions. Basins of water, sitting under the stove from morning to night, were unthawed. Every morning the outer bedclothes would be covered with a thick frost—the frozen breath of the sleepers; and this frost would not disappear at sunrise, nor yet at noonday, but would generally lie, white and crisp, all day long. As if to crown their discomforts, they were forced to use lard lamps, with wicks of canton-flannel, sperm oil having given out or become very dear, and gas and coal-oil being practically unheard-of then. These lard lamps were very inconvenient, and half the time totally unserviceable. They were hard to light and harder to keep burning, going out as soon as the lard congealed, which was almost as soon as they were carried away from the fire, the work of liquefying and lighting anew taking never less than half an hour, and usually more. With all this, the lard, albeit so unsuited to the purpose, was expensive, for which reason the Sisters at night recreation commonly used a save-all, as they did in old times at Georgetown. Thus bravely they kept up the fight against night and winter till relieved by “the rolling year.”

In the spring, as already mentioned, the academy was finished, and they took full possession of their new establishment. But although more comfortably and more monastically fixed, the site was less salubrious than that of the Old Hotel, and the health of the community was not so good as it had been there. The Sisters were nearly all broken down with the intermittent fever, which fastened on its victims with fearful pertinacity. Once attacked, it seemed impossible to get out of its fell grasp. Many became discouraged, and Mother Helen would sometimes burst into tears when information was brought her of some new one stricken down and put to bed. During the vacation, happening fortunately in the sickly season, scarcely were there Sisters enough up to nurse those who were sick, and fill the offices. As many as three at a time were in danger of death. In one summer four or five received the last sacraments, and two novices made their vows conditionally; but in general the sufferers recovered, to be attacked again upon the least exposure. Subsequently to the removal of the community from the Old Hotel, it buried three professed Sisters, one novice, one postulant, one pupil, one orphan child, and a holy secular man in its service. The latter, a Frenchman, of the name of Bouvet, deserves more than a passing mention. A gentleman by birth, a merchant of St. Louis, and a man of wealth and culture, he voluntarily impoverished himself, giving all his property to the Church. He went to Kaskaskia, where he was not known, and worked as journeyman to a Catholic carpenter, as pious as himself. Finally, he sought and obtained permission to live on

the premises of the Sisters, never charging them anything for his work, and at his death leaving them his effects, which included a library of French books. In dying the good man asked to be buried under the gateway of the convent cemetery; but this request, made in his humility, the Sisters denied in their reverence, and laid his body in a quiet nook of the cemetery. In the spring of 1837, it should be remarked, the community had made an urgent application to Georgetown for further assistance, in answer to which Sister Seraphina Wickham volunteered her services, two choir Sisters and a lay sister coming with her. A month after her arrival Sister Seraphina had been elected Superior, and was now, Christmas-tide, 1840, at the head of the community.

The following Christmas was saddened by the death of Sister De Chantal Brawner, who had entered as a postulant in 1836. Sister De Chantal died of typhoid fever, attended with delirium, her sufferings having continued for nine weeks, during which she had been watched by two Sisters night and day, to the exhaustion of the entire community. She was a large woman, of powerful constitution, the very vigor of whose resistance to disease sharpened the pangs of the struggle. Shortly before her death the clouds of delirium parted, and Father St. Cyr, seizing this lucid interval, administered the extreme unction and Viaticum, when darkness closed in upon her again, and she passed, through returning agonies, into the night that knows no morning on the earth. But this dreary Christmas was succeeded by some consolation. On the octave of the Epiphany the Sisters had the happiness of welcoming Bishop Kenrick, then newly-consecrated, and coadjutor to Bishop Rosati, who had been sent as legate or vicar apostolic to Hayti. The new Bishop immediately gave them a chaplain for their convent, and thenceforward they had the blessing of daily mass; in recognition of which they purchased a lot on the other side of the street, and built for their chaplain, Father Heim, a suitable house, wherein, besides living comfortably himself, he might entertain the Bishop when he should visit Kaskaskia. The house of the parish priest, as has been said, was dilapidated, in happy or unhappy unison with the parish church and sacristy, which had fallen into such ruin that the priest sent his best vestments for safe-keeping to the Sisters, who every Sunday and festival day had the vestment for the occasion carried to the church and brought back as soon as the service was over. In the belfry of the old church, to cap the scene, hung the old bell, also in ruins, presented by Louis XV. to the parish of Kaskaskia a century before, and which but the other day, with the consent of the present Bishop of the diocese, was sent to join the more famous relic from Independence Hall at the New Orleans Exhibition, where the cu-

rious visitor might have seen, side by side, the first bell that rang for worship in the West and the first that rang for liberty in all the land. After Bishop Kenrick's visit to Kaskaskia, which seems to have sent fresh life coursing through all the ecclesiastical veins and arteries of the old town, it was decided to build a new church and parsonage, and the work was promptly begun, and, with the help of the pastor's own hands, carried so far as the roofing-in and flooring of the church; when, being already used by the needy congregation, it was overtaken by the dire catastrophe to which we now draw near, and which was the end of ecclesiastical things and of nearly every thing else in Kaskaskia.

On May 12th, 1842, Sister Agnes Brent, the first Superior, was again elected, proving the last at Kaskaskia, as well as the first. The next year there was a division of the diocese, whereby Kaskaskia fell under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Chicago; but Bishop Kenrick, unwilling to lose the Visitation nuns altogether, notified Mother Agnes of his desire to establish a house in St. Louis, and requested her to proceed thither as its first Superior. With this request Mother Agnes made up her mind to comply, selecting, as her associates in the undertaking, Sister Beatrice Tyler, Sister Augustine Barber, Sister Josephine Barber, Sister Agatha Russel, and Sister Magdalene Cremur. On the morning of April 14th, 1844, accordingly, they left Kaskaskia for St. Louis, accompanied by two of the pupils and their father, Major Graham, son of the venerable Dr. C. C. Graham, of Louisville, Ky., whose centennial birthday was lately celebrated with so much *éclat*. A ride of thirty or forty minutes brought them to the bank of the Mississippi, whose waters, they noticed, were high, and still rising—the "little cloud like a man's hand," portending, had they known it, the coming cataclysm; but they did not read the sign. A steamboat upward bound presently heaving in sight, and rounding to at a signal from their party, they went aboard, and in six hours reached St. Louis, and were conveyed to the City Hospital, where for eight days the good Sisters of Charity lavished on them every possible attention and kindness, making those eight days so pleasant as to seem almost days of retreat. In the meantime they rented a house on Sixth street, which was fitting up, and into which some fortnight after their arrival they moved, although, not having a single article of furniture, they could not get settled until cupboards, tables, desks, benches, and the like, were made, and pianos, globes, maps, and all school apparatus and kitchen utensils provided. They were even without bedsteads, and, till these could be got, had to sleep on the floor, the Sisters of Charity lending them pillows. As in the foundation they had left behind them at Kaskaskia, their work began at the beginning.

But before they had fairly entered upon it, the foundation at Kaskaskia, sad to say, was toppling to its fall. The catastrophe came on apace. Two weeks after the departure of Mother Agnes and her associates, the Kaskaskia river, ordinarily two feet lower than the Mississippi now at extraordinary height, began to swell and flood the fields lying between it and the convent garden. On the feast of St. Aloysius the garden was half covered with water, and the Sisters made their last procession in honor of the Sacred Heart over two of the upper walks that continued dry. That night the whole garden was inundated, and at eleven o'clock the following day the water rushed into the cellar. The next morning the well caved in during mass. The situation had now become serious; for the surface soil of the Kaskaskia plain lay on a stratum of quicksand, and it was feared, not without reason, that the entire town would sink in the mighty flood. The Sisters were urged to leave; and at six o'clock the same evening, Mr. Amadée Menard, son of Col. P. Menard, brought a flat-boat, propelled by stout rowers, and, taking Mother Isabella and a good many Sisters, conveyed them to his own dwelling on the bluffs east of the river. This was Saturday evening. The Sisters thus brought off probably had no Mass the next morning, but Father St. Cyr said Mass at the convent for those who remained; and immediately after, the Sunday obligation having been dispensed with, they began packing up, and spent the day in hard work, bundling and sewing, covering carefully with cloths their best pictures and ornaments, and taking down every thing belonging to the altar and chapel, where Mass would never again be celebrated. At breakfast time, they took notice, the bricks in the kitchen sank when they stepped on them, and one end of their refectory was now submerged, making it certain that the first floor, though several feet above the ground, would be entirely under water before night; hence, after packing up, they hastily carried tables, dishes, provisions, utensils and furniture to the assembly-room on the floor overhead, where they passed the remainder of this memorable Sunday, at the close of which they, too, quit their doomed convent, and were rowed to the Bluffs. Col. Pierre Menard, the late proprietor of the mansion on the Bluffs, had just been laid in his grave beneath the weltering waters, having been spared the pain of witnessing the destruction of his beloved convent, the object of his solicitude even in his dying hours. When told on his death-bed of the rapid rise of the Mississippi and Kaskaskia, he said repeatedly, "How are the Sisters?" enjoining his sons to take care of them. He was pre-eminently their benefactor. Their convent in effect had been built up and maintained by him. In the purchase of the land, and in the payment of the notes on the building, he cheerfully

advanced the money, whenever, as happened too often, their means fell short. Neither did he for several years demand any interest, and, when at length he did, it was on the most indulgent terms. Besides, he educated at their school his numerous granddaughters and nieces, and most of their other pupils were obtained through his influence. He died only a few days before the submersion of their grounds, and his house, as we have seen, became their refuge.

Meanwhile, Bishop Kenrick, who had heard nothing of the distress of his nuns, was on the way to Kaskaskia, with their new Bishop, the Rt. Rev. W. Quarter, accompanied also by the Rev. J. Timon and Father de St. Palais, both of whom afterwards became bishops. Bishop Quarter supposed, as did the others, that he was simply to make the acquaintance of a flourishing community that had signalized its transfer to his jurisdiction by giving birth to a new community, destined to flourish likewise in the original diocese ; but far different was the meeting. They found, in place of what they had anticipated, the convent abandoned and the homeless Sisters and children crowded together at the Menard mansion, around which the houseless people of the town had taken refuge under tents and awnings. The arrival of the episcopal party, which was at noon on Monday, proved opportune, for the Menard family, it may be imagined, knew not what to do with the Sisters and their pupils, the latter, I should note, numbering sixteen, all the rest of the fifty composing the convent school at the beginning of the flood having been withdrawn by their friends. Father Heim had gone in quest of a boat, but without success, no captain he saw being willing to come up to Kaskaskia. Father Timon now set out on the same errand, and, hailing a steamboat on its way to St. Louis, induced the captain to put out his own cargo, and turn his boat into the Kaskaskia river. Early on Wednesday morning, June 26th, 1844, before daybreak, the puffing of the rescuing steamer was heard at the Menard dwelling. Mr. Amadée Menard sprang from his bed, and, half dressed, ran out to warn the captain against some dangerous spot in the channel, but was relieved of this necessity on seeing Father Timon standing aloft near the wheel, and directing the pilot. After breakfast, all got on board, and steamed for the convent, of which only one-half appeared above water. A portion of the piazza balustrade was sawed off, and the boat lashed to the house through the doors and windows ; whereupon the bishops and priests led the way in carrying the furniture on board, the Sisters, for their part, lifting whatever their strength would permit. The pianos, harps, stoves, desks, benches, and such things, were put in the hold to serve as ballast. By one o'clock in the afternoon the boat had been loaded as heavily as was safe ; and the Sisters,

bidding adieu forever to their long-loved convent and to Kaskaskia, turned their course towards St. Louis, where they arrived at dawn the next morning: and the sorrowful exodus was accomplished. The steamboat, after unloading, returned to Kaskaskia for the remainder of their furniture, while they, with their pupils, were taken to the house on Sixth street, occupied, it will be remembered, by the Sisters from whom they had recently parted, and who, going forth to found a community, turned out but heralds of the parent house, which, instead of planting a new foundation, transplanted its own. Yet two years were to elapse before the divided community should be restored to unity.

The house on Sixth street was much too small to accommodate the whole community, but the rescued Sisters, not knowing where else to go, remained in it two days and two nights, when Mrs. Thomas, a lady of wealth, came and took six of them out to her newly-enlarged residence in the country. Pending the uncertainty as to their future abode, Mrs. Ann Biddle, sister-in-law of Gen. W. S. Harney, offered them and their pupils a home in her own family, and this generous offer, when Bishop Quarter's proposal to remove them to Chicago had been definitively overruled, they accepted; and early on the following Monday carriages were sent to take them to her dwelling on Fifth street, which was now transformed into both a school and a convent. Mrs. Biddle's house was very large, and she gave up to the use of the refugees all the apartments, excepting one only, her own bedroom, the servants lodging in a back building. She supplied the table of the Sisters, and attended to their every want. Their meals were prepared by her own cook, two of the lay sisters assisting. On the 26th of July, the feast of her patroness, St. Ann, a general communion was offered for this benefactress, and Bishop Kenrick celebrated mass at her house for the same intention. Her back parlor served as the chapel, she having, besides, two front parlors. Mrs. Biddle on the occasion treated the community to a grand *fête*, every feature of which was in sumptuous style. Her kindness did not stop here. After entertaining the Sisters and their sixteen pupils for a full month, she established them, during the summer vacation and before the opening of the first session of their school, in her spacious mansion on Broadway, where the pupils enjoyed the advantage of extensive grounds, with delightful walks and shades. Their school increasing, they built, by the advice of the Bishop, a two-storied structure, containing a dormitory and a play-room, each about forty feet by twenty, with a flight of stairs leading from one to the other. The lower room answered the purpose of study-hall, class-room, and wash-room, as well as play-room. When they left, the Bishop, as he had engaged, took this building at cost, and had it rolled over

to St. Patrick's Church, for the use of the parish school. Mrs. Biddle charged the Sisters for her mansion and premises only a nominal rent, the payment of which, it is believed, was never exacted. The Superior of the Broadway division was Sister Isabella King, under whose charge the last days at Kaskaskia had been spent and the final escape effected. Naturally, her thoughts reverted to that devastated seat of the community, and renewed her solicitude to discharge the pecuniary obligations contracted there. The heirs of Col. P. Menard held the notes of the convent for seventeen thousand dollars, at five per cent. interest. The Sisters, troubled by this indebtedness, endeavored to sell the convent land and buildings at any sacrifice, and had the property advertised for a year in the newspapers of the great eastern cities; but nothing came of it. At length they proposed to the Menard heirs to pay down one-third of the debt in ready money, give the equivalent of another third in schooling, and surrender the land and house for the remaining third. This proposal the heirs agreed to, and the burden which had weighed so heavily on the community was removed.

In July, 1846, after two years of separation, the Sisters on Broadway and those on Sixth street were reunited, taking possession of the Archbishop's place on Ninth street, under Mother Agnes as Superior, the health of Mother Isabella at the time disabling her for the office. Here the community, permanently unified, remained twelve years, enjoying the spiritual blessing of a close proximity to the Lazarist Fathers, who during that time served the convent as chaplains, confessors, and spiritual directors. Here, too, the Sisters built up, on the solid basis of their past but relatively obscure achievements, that splendid superstructure of academic instruction, the fame of which casts lustre upon the West, and does honor to the whole Union. On September 10th, 1846, almost coincident with the reunion of the community, occurred the death of Sister Teresa Lalor, whom our readers will remember as the first Superior of the mother house at Georgetown. Her light went out just as the torch kindled at its flame began to burn with steady brilliancy. In June, 1848, Sister Genevieve King, one of the most loved and most lovable of the community, was elected Superior. Pending the election, a letter came from Bishop Portier, of Mobile, requesting the community to lend his house in that city two or three members. In compliance with this request, the deposed Mother, Sister Agnes Brent, with Sister Helen Flannigan, Sister Augustine Barber, and Sister Cecelia Del Vecchio, left soon afterwards for Mobile, where the latter two Sisters died, Sisters Agnes and Helen returning after a stay of four years. The triennial of Mother Genevieve's government was a period of trials as well as

of blessings. The chief of the former was the interruption of the school twice by pestilence; and among the latter must be included the visit, in the spring of 1850, of the celebrated Father Theobald Mathew, who edified the community in various ways, and to whom its members had the consolation of going to confession. At the close of this triennial the convent elected as its Superior Sister Isabella King, cousin of Sister Genevieve, and one of the most efficient and acceptable administrators it has known.

About this time, Bishop Loras, of Dubuque, wishing to establish a house in his diocese, applied to the Sisters for a colony, which, however, they were unable to spare, the growth of their seminary crowding hard upon their means of teaching, and rendering them more disposed to borrow than lend. Some time in 1852, therefore, Bishop Loras, on behalf of his project, sent one of his priests, Father de Villars, to the house of Monlud, near Lyons, France, the uncle of this priest being at the time, and having been for many years, chaplain and confessor to that community. Father de Villars, on his way to Europe, called at St. Louis. As Mother Isabella remembered with pleasure the French Sisters (models of perfect observance and of every religious virtue) whom she had known at Georgetown, she strongly desired to reinforce her community by two or three such as they, and judged this a favorable opportunity to obtain them. Accordingly, with Archbishop Kenrick's consent, she wrote to Paris by Father de Villars, who, in June, 1853, returned with two Sisters for St. Louis from the First Monastery of Paris, along with his own colony from Monlud. These colonists remained with the St. Louis Sisters about two months to study English, and on their departure for Keokuk, the destined seat of the new house, took with them two of their late entertainers to assist in the school. The two Sisters from Paris stayed at St. Louis a twelvemonth, when one, Sister Augustine Borgia, gave her services to the Keokuk house for a year or more, and then went back to Paris; the other, Sister Frances Gonzaga, returned directly to Paris, where, in the fall of 1869, the writer had the pleasure of seeing her, still far from what Victor Hugo calls the youth of age, and in the full bloom of her conventual graces.

In the interim, a home for the community, suited to its thriving state and commanding reputation, had been in course of erection on Cass Avenue, and at length neared completion. The lot on which this edifice was built, it is proper to say, had been bequeathed to the Sisters by Mrs. Ann Biddle, the excellent lady, meanwhile deceased, who had befriended them in the days of the flood, and whose benefactions ended only with her life. The time now approached for their last removal. The extensive additions they had made to

the archiepiscopal buildings on Ninth street the Archbishop received in lieu of rent, and in the spring of 1858 they were installed in their permanent home; from which have gone forth, as had gone forth in lesser number from previous stations of the community, pupils who are or were the heads and ornaments of households, not only in every section of the Republic, but in many of the princely seats of Europe. It has been, as it is, a teeming hive of sound and elegant culture. In this home the community abides; and with its stately grandeur are now associated, by inheritance or acquirement, all the respect and all the renown achieved, through harsh vicissitudes, in more than half a century of labor and of sacrifice, stretching away from this superb consummation in the great metropolis of the valley back to the humble beginnings at Kaskaskia, and studded throughout, not less thickly in the opening than elsewhere, with shining deeds and heroic sufferings. Yet the consummation alone, engrossing the honor of the whole career, fixes the public gaze. Nor is this unnatural. It is ever so. The triumphant present, filling the eyes of men, is everything; the militant past, unknown or forgotten, is nothing. Nevertheless, it is not just, even to the crowning state; for the present, sundered from the past, is shorn in part of its true glory; and it is the purpose of this paper, by recalling the past of a great Institute and linking it with the present, to do, in some imperfect measure, justice to both.

Here we take leave of the Visitation Convent of St. Louis, reminding the reader, however, that we do so at a period distant a quarter of a century, in which the house has enlarged and heightened its fame, and, despite the clouds, and hailstorms, and thunderbolts of civil war (part of which it saw and all of which it felt), has strengthened its firm hold on the esteem and admiration of the country. The chapter of the civil war forms, indeed, one of the most thrilling and not the least creditable in the history of the convent. But our task is done. Having traced the rise of the community from the first streaks of dawn in the east, through gloom and tempest, to the unclouded zenith, we may fitly stand aside; its noontide splendor proclaims itself. Yet we may linger to note an incident not less grateful than pathetic. Of the noble company of the founders, one alone survives—Sister Josephine Barber; who but very recently celebrated the completion of the fiftieth year of her profession—her golden jubilee. May the life of this devout and gifted woman long be spared to the community which for two generations she has served and adorned.

WHAT ARE ANIMALS AND PLANTS?

THIS question: "What are animals and plants?" is a large question. In order to be able to reply to it we must know both (1) what animals and plants are, as contrasted with substances which are neither the one nor the other; and (2) how animals and plants stand towards each other—their relations and their differences. Only by learning these two things can we possibly know what animals and plants *are*.

The common sense, however, of the overwhelming majority of men will make short work of the first question; they will say: "Animals and plants are *living things*, while all other visible substances are but composed of *dead matter*." Now, we have no quarrel with common sense, we fully accept its dictates, but the patient and admirable researches of generations of men of science, and the speculations of modern philosophers, have made known so many curious phenomena, and have brought forward so many objections, that it is no longer possible for him who would be able to give an account of the belief that is in him concerning the world and its inhabitants, to rest satisfied with such a rough and ready reply.

Similarly, with regard to the second question,—the relations between animals and plants,—most men would, perhaps, reply that "animals are living creatures, which move about, and get their living by the help of their senses, while plants are living creatures devoid of sense and, for the most part, rooted to the ground."

Now, this is really a very good answer, as far as it goes, and truly expresses the distinction existing between the immense majority of the two groups of living things. Nevertheless, here again the discovery of fresh phenomena has brought us face to face with difficulties and puzzles, some of which seem, as yet, insoluble.

To put as shortly as possible what appears to be the outcome of modern scientific progress, it has, on the one hand, served to render more marked the distinction between living beings and creatures devoid of life; while, on the other hand, it has continually made more and more evident that (in spite of the distinctions between most of them) animals and plants form one great whole, and must be scientifically treated together, as well as separately.

Thus, to the two sciences of zoölogy and botany, which refer to animals and plants respectively, we have now added a fresh science, the science of BIOLOGY, which treats of animals and plants taken together, collectively, as forming *one great group*.

That the reader may have some faint notion how vast this great

group is, it may be well hastily to survey the main classes of creatures which together compose it. We think it desirable to do so, because very inadequate images are apt to rise before the minds of most persons unacquainted with natural science, when they use such words as "animals" and "plants," since they naturally think most of those with which they are the most familiar.

Thus, they are familiar with certain beasts, birds, reptiles, and fishes, but know little of the number of them. Of birds, ten thousand distinct kinds are known, and upwards of four thousand kinds of lizards, and sixteen hundred kinds of snakes have been described; while fishes are so rich in species that they probably equal in the number of their kinds the whole mass of beasts, birds, and reptiles taken together!

But such creatures as these form but a very small proportion of all animals. Creatures such as snails and oysters form another vast group, known as "mollusks."

Worms, also, have been formed into a division, so varied in nature and so prodigious in number that their proper classification is amongst the most difficult of zoölogical problems.

The star fishes and their allies constitute another great group, rich both in species and diversities of form.

But the whole of the creatures we have yet referred to, taken together in one mass, are far exceeded in number of species by the class of insects alone, of which one or more are associated with the life of each and every land plant, and probably that of every higher animal also; while closely allied to the insects are the multitudinous tribes of lobsters, shrimps, crabs, spiders, and scorpions.

We have also to take into account those coral animals which have actually built up large tracts of the earth's habitable surface; and besides these, we have their humble followers, the sponges.

All the creatures yet referred to are cognizable by our ordinary senses, but there are, as is commonly known, myriads of kinds, either so small as to be altogether invisible to the naked eye, or else invisible as regards the main points of their structure without the aid of the microscope. All the lowest animals, the bodies of which are not made up of distinct organic substances, or tissues, are called PROTOZOA.

Then, as to plants: besides the families of flowering trees, shrubs, creepers, and herbs, with members of which we unconsciously become more or less familiar, there are a multitude of other families, specimens of which we only see in our occasional visits to the hot houses of our botanical gardens. To these follow the almost numberless kinds of plants which do *not* flower—the ferns, horse-tails, grasses, lichens, seaweeds (with their fresh-water allies), and

fungi. Parallel with the microscopic creatures ordinarily classed as "animals," are the microscopic plants, some of which have been, till of late years, the despair of the surgeon, while others are now recognized as, or suspected to be, the cause and origin of the most painful and dangerous diseases.

Multitudinous, however, as is the animal and vegetable life which we have about us to-day, it is but a remnant of that of which this planet has been the theatre; and especially wonderful are the discoveries of fossil remains which have been made in North America, revealing to us the past existence of living forms such as had not been pictured even in the recorded musings of any naturalist. Apart from such wonderful scientific novelties, we have in the ancient chalk cliffs, and the far more ancient coal-fields, abundant evidence of the prodigality and duration of past vitality; the chalk as it were still in process of formation, as the ooze slowly forming in the bed of the Atlantic Ocean; the coal affording evidence that rich vegetable life flourished at a period so remote that, during it, the first appearance of the chalk might have seemed as the dream of an infinitely distant future.

It is this immensely complex mass of living beings which we have to regard, in their totality, as one whole, as well as in their two component groups, if we would know what "animals" and "plants" really are.

But in order that we may learn *what* they are, it will be well first to advert briefly to one or two facts concerning things which are neither plants nor animals, certain facts, that is, about the "*inorganic* world," by which we mean the solid earth with its two envelopes—water and air. All the substances of which this inorganic world is composed are either (1) elements, such, *e. g.*, as the gas oxygen or the metal iron; or (2) compounds of elements, such, *e. g.*, as rust, which consists of oxygen and iron united to form a third substance which is neither the one nor the other.

Very many substances can exist (as water can) in three states, solid (ice), fluid (water), *aëriform* (vapor).

A solid inorganic substance may be either in the form of crystal (as marble) or not crystalline (as chalk), while having all the time the same chemical composition. Thus both marble and chalk can be resolved into (1) lime and (2) a gas, commonly known as carbonic acid gas, and carbonic acid is again resolvable into (1) oxygen and (2) carbon, or pure charcoal.

The *aëriform* envelope of this planet, that is AIR, is a mixture of the two gases (1) oxygen and (2) nitrogen, with some carbonic acid gas and a certain amount of ammonia and the vapor of water.

Oxygen, itself incombustible, is the great burner or aider of combustion.

Nitrogen is remarkable at once both for its own inertness and for its instability; so that it is an ingredient in all the most explosive compounds, such as gunpowder, guncotton, nitroglycerine and the iodide, sulphide, and chloride of nitrogen.

Of *carbonic acid* there are ordinarily but four cubic feet in ten thousand cubic feet of air; yet so great is the quantity of it contained in the whole atmosphere that there are reckoned to be 371,475 tons of it in the column of atmosphere which extends above each square mile of the earth's surface.

WATER, the earth's *fluid* envelope, consists of oxygen, hydrogen, carbonic acid, ammonia, carbonate of lime, flint (in solution), and sundry salts. It is, as it were, the mother substance of life, both historically and physiologically, and has been a great agent in both the production and the destruction of fossil remains: the first, by its *deposits*; the second, by its *eroding agency*. The Mississippi has formed thirty thousand square miles of deposits, which are in places several hundred feet thick. The Ganges carries down yearly to the sea as much mud as could be carried down by 730,000 ships, each of 1400 tons' burthen. The eroding and destructive agency of water is, on the other hand, notorious.

With these preliminary notices concerning the inorganic or non-living world, we may next review such contrasts as may be drawn between it and the living world, of animals and plants, considered as one whole.

I. Now, in the first place, some inorganic substances are fluid and some solid, some moist and some dry; but every living creature, without exception, is more or less fluid, and composed to a greater or less degree of water, especially its more actively vital or growing parts.

Thus, in the human brain, seventy out of every hundred parts are composed of water, and in the jelly-fish no less than ninety-nine parts out of a hundred are so composed.

II. Many inorganic substances, such as crystals, are bounded by flat surfaces and straight lines, but living creatures have bodies which are bounded by curved surfaces and lines.

III. The chemical composition of inorganic substances is most various; some, like gold, consist of but a single element; others, like water, of two elements; others of several and very different ones.

All living bodies, on the other hand, are of very uniform chemical composition, as they invariably consist of oxygen, hydrogen, and carbon, together with the element nitrogen—the unstable nature of which has already been referred to in speaking of the in-

organic compounds containing nitrogen, which thus seems a fitting element to enter into the composition of anything so prone to change as is living matter.

IV. In every animal and plant these four elements (oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen) unite to form a special substance known as *protoplasm*, of which every living organism is at first entirely composed, while the whole inorganic world is destitute of such material.

This curious substance, while living, has six very remarkable powers:

(1.) A power of internal circulation, or of the movement of various parts of its substance within the whole, unlike anything in the inorganic world.

(2.) A power of contraction and expansion under conditions different from those which contract and expand inorganic substances.

(3.) A power of performing chemical changes and evolving heat more gently and continuously than in the combustion of inorganic bodies.

(4.) A power of converting other adjacent substances into material like itself—into its own substance.

(5.) A power of forming from its own substance substances both different from its own and from substances adjacent to it. Thus it is that since every living creature consists at first entirely of protoplasm, every *other* kind of substance found in every animal or plant comes from protoplasm and is formed by its agency.

(6.) A power of exchanging gases with its environment—notably of absorbing oxygen and giving out carbonic acid.

These exclusively vital powers of living particles of protoplasm give to each whole organism of which they form a part certain further characters by which they all differ from the inorganic world. Thus:

V. Every living creature, whether plant or animal, effects that interchange of gases just mentioned (absorbing oxygen and giving out carbonic acid), that is to say, it respire or breathes—whatever other changes it may effect.

VI. Every living being is a creature requiring food, which it has the power of changing into its own substance, and so, at least for a time, augmenting its size by a process of growth. This growth is not a mere *external* increment, like the growth of a crystal suspended in a suitable medium, but is an augmentation of its intimate innermost substance by what is called *intussusception*.

VII. Every living creature thus grows according to a more or less definite law, from a single, minute, spheroidal mass of protoplasm into that shape and structure which is characteristic of the group to which it belongs.

VIII. In this process each such creature forms certain substances which are *not* protoplasm,—at the very least it forms minute granules which may be fatty or starchy; while, generally, living creatures *do* form the most complex structures, namely, all those found in the animal and vegetable kingdoms—the woods, resins, oils and sugars of plants, and all the varied components of the bodies of animals; this process is known as “*secretion*.”

By this latter process the living world, as one whole, is continually taking matter from the earth's ærial and aqueous envelopes and adding it to the substance of the earth's solid crust. The past effect of this action we see, as before mentioned, in the enormous fields of coal and peat; in the extensive chalk formations and coral reefs (one reef extending for a thousand miles along the coast of Australia, and such structures forming a great part of Florida); in the vast accumulations of fossil remains—evidenced by the fact that the fossil ear bones of whales (a valuable manure) have given rise to a lawsuit, and by the five million cubic feet of shell-sand annually collected on the shores of Devon and Cornwall.

As to the present activity of the vegetable world in this direction, we have but to recollect that the Empire of Brazil is mainly a forest region which may be roughly represented as an equilateral triangle, each side of which is twelve hundred miles long, and that other vast regions of the earth's surface are, like it, clothed not only with herbage, but with teeming vegetable produce of all kinds and dimensions.

Now, if we suppose two-thirds of the earth's dry land to be clothed with only such vegetation as may be estimated to produce an average increase of its substance, amounting to but one three hundred and sixty-fifth part of an inch daily, then we should have freshly formed each year as much vegetal matter as would constitute a cube fifteen miles in extent in each of such cube's three dimensions!

IX. But living creatures not only grow and develop their own bodies; they also reproduce their kind; and this is again an action to which there is nothing comparable or analogous in the whole inorganic world.

Thus every living being may be said to be a creature possessing an innate tendency to undergo a definite cycle of changes when exposed to certain fixed conditions; that is, when supplied with an adequate amount of temperature, moisture, suitable gaseous matter, food, etc. Inorganic and dead substances may tend to undergo a *series* of changes, but such series never constitutes a “*cycle*”—*i.e.*, a series returning to the point whence it set out. We see such a *cycle* of changes in the egg, the chick, the fowl, and the egg again; or the egg, the grub, the chrysalis, the butterfly, and ultimately its

egg; or the seed, the young plant, the mature plant, the flower, the fruit, and the seed again.

Inorganic substances tend simply to persist as they are, and have no definite relations either to the past or to the future. Whence it comes, or what it has been or shall be, is nothing to its present being—which is its *only* being. But every living creature, at every step of its life, regards both the past and the future, and thus lives continually in a definite relation to both these as well as to the present. Every stage of its cycle of life, just because it *is* a cycle, is conditioned by the anterior states which alone have made it possible, and refers to future states for which it is in active preparation. Thus, as it were, at every present moment of its existence, it lives *both* in the past and in the future, a mode of existence which attains its fullest development in the highest living organism—man, the one creature emphatically, because consciously, “looking before and after!”

X. But living creatures present another still more distinctive character, one which is indeed but obscurely indicated in plants, but is very evident in animals. This is *the power of forming habits*, which is itself the sign of the possession of a special *internal spontaneity* in living things, by which they each and all tend to act and to “react” *when acted upon*.

For what is a “habit?” A “habit” is not formed by repeated actions, though it may be strengthened and confirmed by them. If an act performed *once only* had not in it *some* power of generating a “habit,” then a thousand repetitions of that act would not generate it. Habit is the determination in one definite direction of a previously vague tendency to action. All living organisms tend to act. With them action is not only their nature, ‘tis a positive *want*. Moreover, within limits, the powers and energies of living creatures increase with action, and diminish, and finally perish, through repose. Thus the general activity and power of organisms, and also the exercise of this power in definite modes and directions, are facilitated and increased by actions in the very first of which the power of “generating habit” lies hid.

This second, mysterious, internal tendency, as we have said, eminently distinguishes living organisms from all inorganic bodies, and leads naturally to the next point we would refer to.

Closely allied to habit is *instinct*, a power, the presence of which cannot indeed be adduced as a character distinguishing all living beings from bodies devoid of life, but which none the less is so remarkable a property of many animals that it may well claim, *for our present purpose*, to be here briefly referred to in passing.

We have no space here to describe at length examples of animal instinct; we can but very briefly refer to such well-known instances

as the simulated lameness of certain birds, the insects which become quiescent to escape an enemy (what is wrongly called shamming death), and provision for the future, as in the wasp sphex, the carpenter bee and the stag beetle. Certain instincts, however, have a very peculiar significance; such are those by which a grub will repair its injured cocoon or a spider its injured web, and those by which lobsters and crabs, when one of their limbs is injured, will throw off the injured stump as far up as one of its joints, whence alone the limb can again grow forth and be reproduced. Such creatures cannot be supposed to *know* the effect of such spontaneous amputations, and therefore their actions lead us naturally to consider other unconscious organic actions by which lost parts are more or less perfectly reproduced—actions which display a purpose and intention (although unconscious) in a way which resembles nothing in the inorganic world.

In the process of healing and repair of a wounded part of our body, a fluid, perfectly structureless, substance is secreted, or poured forth from the parts about the wound. In this substance small particles of protoplasm, called “cells,” arise and become abundant, so that the substance, at first structureless, becomes what is called “cellular tissue.” Then, by degrees, this structure transforms itself into vessels, tendons, nerves, bone, and membrane—into some or all such parts—according to circumstances.

In a case of broken bone its two broken ends soften, their sharp edges thus disappearing. Then a soft substance is secreted, and this becomes at first gelatinous, often afterwards cartilaginous, and, finally, osseous or bony. But not only do these different matters arise and develop themselves in such a neutral substance, but very complex structures, appropriately formed and nicely adjusted for the performance of varied functions, may also be developed. Thus a certain railway guard had his arm so injured that he was compelled to have the elbow, with its joint, cut out; but he afterwards developed a new joint almost as good as the old one. In the uninjured condition of these parts, the outer bone of the lower arm—the *radius*—ends above in a smooth-surfaced cup, which plays against part of the lower end of the bone of the upper arm, or *humerus*, while its side also plays against the side of the other bone of the lower arm (called the *ulna*) with the interposition of a cartilaginous surface. The *radius* and *ulna* are united to somewhat descending processes, at the lower end of the humerus, by dense and strong membranes or ligaments. Such was the condition of the parts which were removed by the surgeon. Nine years after the operation the patient died, and the well-known surgeon, Mr. Syme, had the opportunity of dissecting the arm, which in the meantime had served the poor man perfectly well, he having been

in the habit of swinging himself by it from one carriage to another while the train was in motion, quite as easily and securely as with the other arm. On examination Mr. Syme found that the amputated end of the radius had formed fresh polished surfaces and played both against the *humerus* and *ulna* as before, a sort of cartilaginous material being freshly interposed. The ends of the bones of the forearm were again locked in by two freshly formed descending processes of the humerus, and were again joined to the latter by freshly formed strong and dense ligaments. Repairs of injuries of a far more surprising kind are found amongst the lower animals, and repair in the vegetal world is so common that it ceases to excite our surprise. Such unconscious and purposive organic actions are allied to instinctive action, using that term in a wide analogical sense. But *truly* instinctive actions take place IN US at the dawn of life. It is by the aid of such alone that the infant lives. Instinctive also are many of the phenomena of adolescence and those of the earlier years of our own race—for no one can maintain that the first beginnings of literature, art, science, or politics were ever deliberately invented.

How, then, are we to regard that great world of living creatures, both the lower and the higher members of which present phenomena so different from anything to be found in the whole inorganic world? Are, or are not, the bodies of animals and plants vehicles for the exhibition of some force or energy radically different from any to be found in the non-living world about them, or are all their actions to be regarded as only the very curious activities of very complex machines, moved by no other power than such as are inherent in the inanimate matters of this planet? Are we, in a word, to accept a merely mechanical explanation of the universe, or must we demand something more, and if so, what?

To many of our readers it may seem altogether absurd to attempt to explain the phenomena of life in terms of the movements of solid particles. Their common sense revolts at such an explanation, but "common-sense" cannot be allowed by itself to decide any question when an appeal has once been made to the higher tribunal of pure reason, and such an appeal *has* been made.

For there can be no question but that a thoroughly mechanical conception of nature is the scientific ideal of a very large and a very influential school of thinkers, and is the goal towards which they strive—following the footsteps of their great predecessor Descartes. Thus Kirchenthoff tells us that "the highest object at which the natural sciences are constrained to aim, is the reduction of all the phenomena of nature to mechanics." Helmholtz has declared that "the aim of the natural sciences is to resolve themselves into mechanics." According to Wundt, "the problem of physi-

ology is a reduction of vital phenomena to general physical laws, and ultimately to the fundamental laws of mechanics ;” and Haeckel tells us that “all natural phenomena without exception, from the motions of the celestial bodies to the growth of plants and the consciousness of men are ultimately to be reduced to atomic mechanics.”

Many, if not most, of the scientific men of our day strongly favor a mechanical explanation of nature, and treat with disfavor, not to say contempt, the conception of a distinct *kind* of energy or a “VITAL FORCE”—a conception which has been maintained by a school of physiologists called on that account “*vitalists*.”

Now it is surely not to be supposed that this preference for “mechanism” by so many distinguished men of science can be due to any mere prejudice on their part, or that there are not some good and substantial reasons *why* they should favor it, and yet it is hard to suppose that the common sense of mankind, which has ever opposed the mechanical view, can be entirely due to a mere delusion either, and have *no* solid support from reason !

Let us first for a moment consider what is the aim and end of all physical science. Surely it is to understand the coexistences and successions of natural phenomena in such a way that they can not only be arranged in convenient groups suitable for the limited powers of the human intellect to grasp, but also serve as a basis of scientific prediction—while the coming true of “predictions” which men of science feel justified in making affords a strong ground for believing that the operations which served as a basis for such fulfilled predictions were themselves true.

Thus, as regards the science of astronomy, who does not now see that our conceptions of the motions of the heavenly bodies have been greatly facilitated by the discovery of the law of gravitation ? and who does not perceive in the verification of scientific prophecy, by the discovery of the planet Neptune, a signal triumph of modern astronomical science ?

Nevertheless, the fulfilment of predictions alone will not always suffice to prove the absolute truth of the views upon which they are supposed to be based, or else the prediction of eclipses by astronomers who followed the Ptolemaic system would have proved the truth of that erroneous theory.

Bearing in mind, however, the aim and end of physical science, let us next glance at the only means which it is in the power of scientific men to use. These means are the employment of present sense-impressions, together with the reproduction in the investigation of groups of past sense-impressions.

All our knowledge is called forth by the play of surrounding nature upon our sense-organs ; nor can we imagine *anything* which

we have not previously had sensuous experience of—at least in its elements or component parts.

Again, there is a quality of distinctness and vividness in our sense-impressions. How vague, for example, is our imagination of a perfume, compared with our imagination of a visible triangular figure, or of a cube, or of a ball, held in the hand?

It is especially what is *visible* and *tangible* that comes home most readily to the imagination; vague internal sensations are always described by us in terms of sight or touch. We speak of a “*gnawing*” pain, a “*sharp*” pain, *like a knife*, a “*rough*” taste, and even a “*bright*” intellect, and a “*hard*” heart.

Now, the “*explanation*” of any phenomenon may be its reference to the causes which produce it; but its “*explanation*” is very often nothing more than the assigning of some new or unfamiliar object to a class of objects which has already become familiar; and our minds are so formed that they feel an almost inevitable satisfaction in the reference of some object or action, difficult or impossible to imagine, to a class of objects or actions easy to imagine, and this whether or not such reference, when closely examined, turns out to be really justifiable, and therefore truly satisfactory.

Now there is nothing so easy for us to imagine as the motions of solid bodies, phenomena which appeal both to sight and touch. Thus it is that (apart from scientific utilities we shall shortly refer to) “*heat*,” “*light*,” “*chemical phenomena*,” the action of nerves and of brain cells, are apt to appear easier to understand, and to be more or less “*explained*,” when they are spoken of as “*MODES OF MOTION*.”

Nevertheless, such an explanation of the action of living beings is, as we have said, shocking to common sense, and therefore, as has just been mentioned, another force was invented to account for them, and the actions of living beings have been explained as being due to the energizing within them of a “*VITAL FORCE*.”

But the doctrine of the existence of any such force has been more and more successfully opposed by men of science on the ground that (1) living beings are *not* isolated phenomena in nature, but are affected by and react upon all physical forces; (2) that no distinct evidence is forthcoming of the existence of any such “*vital force* ;” and (3) that while the use of such a conception in no way furthers the ends of science, the mechanical conception of nature aids in the discovery of natural laws, and has powerfully helped on the progress of science.

And it is true that living beings are *far indeed* from being isolated; for the life of each largely consists of an interplay between what we consider its own body and environing nature. So intimate, in fact, is the connection between each of us and his environ-

ment, that it is even difficult to determine, in minute detail, the line of separation between the two. Food, even when swallowed, is not yet "the tissue." When digested and entering the absorbents which convey it to the bloodvessels which carry it to the intimate tissues of the body, who can say exactly how soon the foreign body becomes the living being, or precisely when and where it is transformed into our very substance? It is the same with the streams of air carrying inwards the life-sustaining oxygen and outwards the deleterious vapors. By such agencies the outer world blends with us and we with it. Far from finding any such indubitable evidence of the existence of a "vital force," as we have of those phenomena we speak of as "heat," "motion," and "light," each living organism thus viewed purely from the standpoint of *physical science* seems, in the words of a distinguished German philosopher, Lotze, only as a place in space where the matter, the forces and the motions of the general course of Nature meet each other in relations favorable for the production of vital phenomena. These phenomena excite our admiration, as do the phenomena of heat and pictorial transmission in that part of space near a lens which is called its "focus." Yet the phenomena of the focus are not explained by any peculiar force common to all "foci" (and so comparable with the agency of "vital force"), but are scientifically accounted for by light and the agencies of media of different densities, through which it is said to be transmitted.

The life of an organism may be compared (*from the physical science point of view*) to the quiet light of a wax candle which seems, to the uninstructed observer, to be the simple action of what he calls "fire," while to the man of science it is a most complicated series of changes, chemical and physical—oxygenation, decomposition, the formation of water, capillary attraction, etc., etc., all of which must be taken together to explain by their diverse simultaneous activities, the apparently simple effect.

But not only is the existence of a diffused "vital force" not demonstrable, and not only do men of science yield to a general tendency of human nature in imaging forth the world's activities generally, in terms of moving matter; but they very properly advocate the use of a means which experience has shown them to be most efficacious for their own legitimate end, which is the progress of physical science. The wonderful discoveries which modern research has made, have been made, not by investigating the ebb and flow of an imaginary "vital force," but by the application to the study of living nature of the previously ascertained laws of chemistry and physics. The discovered laws of the phenomena of digestion, of respiration, of the circulation of the nutritive fluids, etc., are all instances of the successful application of

physics to the investigation of the phenomena of life. To that fruitful source alone we have also to look for the remedies of the physical ills of bodily life, for the perfecting of the trained skill of the physician, as well as, and no less than, that of the more obviously mechanical art of surgery.

Physical science can repose upon and appeal to nothing but things evident to the senses. It is thus compelled to make use of a mechanical imagination of nature, and no blame can therefore attach to physicists who regard this as their *practical* ideal, and attend exclusively to the physical forces, disregarding that discredited figment termed "vital force."

Should we, then, really accept the mechanical theory of the universe as an ABSOLUTE TRUTH? and are we to regard the world of animals and plants as presenting no really *essential* difference from that of the inorganic world?

We are far from thinking men *are* compelled to do this, and we will endeavor briefly to give our reasons why we think men are *not* so compelled.

Physical science is great, but it is not everything; and it cannot, by its very nature, be supreme. It essentially reposes upon our sense-perceptions, but it is not "*sense*," but "*intellect*" which is and *must* be supreme in us. It is not "*sense*," but "*thought*," which tells us that we have sense-perceptions at all, and which criticises them and makes use of them. They are the indispensable servants of our intellect, without them it cannot move a step, but they are none the less its *servants*. Though we can have no imagination, and therefore no thoughts, till our minds are roused to activity by the action of the world about us on our sense-organs; though we can imagine nothing of the elements of which we have not had sensuous experience, nevertheless we gain *through* the ministry of sense that which is *not* sensuous, but which regulates our every thought and rational action. The great principle, called *that of contradiction*, which lies at the root of our intellectual life—the principle that *nothing can, at the same time, "be" and "not be,"* may be taken as the type of conceptions which are gained *through* sense, but are not *of* sense.

Reason in man is supreme; and it relates to those first principles which have been recognized by one of our greatest living physicists as "*underlying all physical science.*" Great, therefore, as may be the *utility* of a mechanical view of nature, fully justified as men of science are in making use of it, and advocating its use for their own ends, it by no means follows that we should regard this useful working hypothesis as the *very truth*! We should or should not so regard it according as it may appear when viewed,

not in the light of physical science, but in that of philosophy, which is the *judge of physical science*.

Here, then, we may return, for a moment, to the consideration of nature as the arena for the play of forces, whether "physical" or "vital."

It is, as we know, the scientific fashion of the day (and a *practically* useful fashion) to regard the phenomena of living beings as "physical," and to also consider the various physical forces, heat, light, chemical affinity, etc., as so many *modes of motion*.

But when we raise ourselves above the horizon of physical science to the broader outlook of philosophy, can we then regard this practical reduction of all things to "motion" as really an explanation?

We have freely conceded that "vital force" is a figment, but what are we to say of heat, light, and motion also? Are *they* realities?

In fact, they are in *themselves* nothing more than abstractions of the mind. There is no such thing as "heat," or as "motion;" though, of course, there are numberless warm bodies of different temperatures, while as to the quality "moving," nothing, so far as we know, is absolutely at rest. But they are commonly spoken of as if they were *not mere qualities of bodies*, but actual *substances*, which may pass from one body into another and mutually transform themselves. To explain the phenomena of living beings, then, by "mechanical motion," however practically convenient for the investigation of physical science, is, from the point of view of pure reason, a philosophical absurdity. It is an attempt to explain them by a nonentity—a mental abstraction from a certain quality found in things. Moreover, as living creatures make known to us various *different* "qualities," to attempt to explain them all by different *quantities* of *one only quality* is an attempt to extract the category of QUALITY out of the category of QUANTITY, which every one at all versed in philosophy will recognize as a self-evident absurdity.

Please recollect that we are in no way objecting to the use of such conceptions as that of the "transformation of force" for the purpose of aiding calculations and for general advance in physical science; we only object to the incautious use of such language as may lead persons to believe that "forces" are *substances*, or to the notion that such conceptions are really profound truths; as if we really knew physical motion better than we do thought or will.

What essential distinction, then, does there remain to draw between living beings and beings devoid of life? There remains that distinction which was drawn more than two thousand two hundred years ago by the greatest of philosophers, and which has the advantage of agreeing with what common sense tells us to-day.

It is the view that each living being, in addition to possessing those properties of which the senses inform us, also possesses, or rather is, a unifying principle, "*a principle of individuation*" which altogether escapes the cognizance of our senses, though reflective reason agrees with common sense in assuring us that it is by it that an animal concentrates into one mental centre the multitude of impressions made simultaneously and successively upon its various organs of sense.

This view, at once popular and philosophic, has of late years received a remarkable adhesion from one who has been amongst the foremost advocates of a mechanical conception of nature. We refer to the German philosopher, Hermann Lotze, a man free altogether from theological or other prejudices or prepossessions. Moved alone by a profound and patient exercise of his reason, he has come to enunciate in the most uncompromising way that view (so long ago maintained by Aristotle), the existence in each living being of a "Psyche"—a term most difficult to render into our own tongue because of the misleading connotation of the word "soul," which is its nearest English equivalent.

The existence of such an internal principle *in ourselves*, is the most certain object of all knowledge. It is conceivable that we may doubt as to the existence of our body, but it is absolutely impossible to doubt the existence of a something which is actually thinking and feeling, and which recollects more or less of its own past. This knowledge, as to our own nature, enables us to conceive the existence of a principle of individuation in other living beings, though we can never *imagine* such a thing, which, as Lotze says, is as impossible as to know *how things look in the dark*.

The recognition of the existence of this principle, however, is a matter of philosophy, or pure science, and not of mere physical science, which must ignore it, since it cannot rise to its recognition without going beyond its own province, which is nature, as cognizable to us in and by our senses.

Nevertheless, physical science may serve to confirm the teaching of philosophy, inasmuch as the whole tendency of modern researches is to show that living creatures do not arise except from antecedent living creatures and refutes the notion of "spontaneous generation." We have no disinclination to believe in spontaneous generation; we confess, it has been with reluctance that we have found ourselves forced by experimental evidence—especially by the evidence adduced by M. Pasteur, to whom we are all so greatly indebted—to reject all belief in it.

According to our present knowledge, then, a great gulf yawns between the living world and the world devoid of life—a gulf which nothing we can imagine seems capable of bridging over. It is true

that certain physicists think that though spontaneous generation cannot take place *now*, it must have taken place a long while ago; but if asked *why* they think this, they have no reply but that they cannot otherwise imagine how living creatures could have ever come to be! But we have had no experience of creatures "coming to be." No wonder, then, if we cannot imagine it; for we can imagine nothing of which we have not had sensuous experience. The wisest course, I venture to think, is at present to say that physical science affords us no ground for affirming anything one way or another about the mode in which living things came to be, though it affirms the *fact* that all our experience is against the *spontaneous* origin of *living things*.

If this conception, that the essential, intimate nature of living things is something beyond the reach of the senses, commends itself, on reflection, to the reader's reason, he will then see how pregnant with true philosophy, and how essentially sufficient, is the popular, common-sense reply to the question, "What are animals and plants?" namely, the answer that "*they are living things*," in so far as it implies that each has its own principle of individuation and of *spontaneous internal activity*.

Apart, however, from the acceptance of this view, we have seen that the totality of animals and plants form together a single immense group of creatures, possessing the ten characteristics which we have hereinbefore briefly enumerated, namely, that they are more or less rounded, aqueous, protoplasmic bodies, of very uniform chemical composition—breathing, feeding, secreting, and growing by intussusception, according to definite laws, reproducing their kind by a series of cyclical changes, and more or less able to form habits through their internal spontaneity.

Such is our answer to the first question: "What are animals and plants, as contrasted with substances which are neither the one nor the other?" It remains to say a few words as to the second question—that concerning the relations of animals and plants, one to the other.

At first sight nothing could seem more obvious than the distinctness of animals from plants; but a very little science soon shows that to draw a distinction is not so easy a matter. Elaborate and recondite distinctions have been, one after another, drawn out, but these have, one after another, broken down, until there remains no one character which can be at the same time affirmed of all animals and denied of all plants (or *vice versa*), while these two great groups remain such as they are generally taken to be, the creatures known as Protozoa being reckoned as animals; that is, the lowest so-called animals, the bodies of which are not constituted of "*tissues*."

Let us look at these distinctions, beginning with the most obvious :

1. The first of these relates to external form. The predominant branching vegetal form is denoted by the word "*arborescent*," but many species of the animals (allied to the Corals) are arborescent also, while multitudes of the lowest plants are more or less spheroidal, and some are worm-like in figure.

2. Secondly, locomotion is common to almost all animals, but some are permanently fixed, like plants, while certain lower plants, especially in the earlier stages of their existence, are actively locomotive.

3. Animals generally live on more or less solid food, which they take into an internal digestive cavity. All animals, however, do not do this, notably the Entozoa, while certain plants are said to more or less nourish themselves on captured prey, as is the case with Venus's fly-trap and *Dionœa* (the sun-dew), while others, as the Pitcher plants, can receive them into a cavity, which is, to a certain extent, comparable with the animal alimentary cavity, since that is, morphologically, but an involution of the external surface.

4. Plants generally contain a greater amount of non-nitrogenous material in their composition than do animals generally, but this distinction is of little avail as regards the lowest forms of life of both groups.

5. Plants generally have a less evident power of forming habits or of responding to stimuli by increased activity ; but this again does not serve as a distinction as regards the lower plants and animals.

6. Until quite recently it could be said that no animals possess that power of liberating carbonic acid and fixing carbon which is possessed by plants ; but now it is known that certain worms also exercise this power. Nevertheless, we may still say that plants generally possess the power of feeding directly on the inorganic world and building up organic matter from it, while the animal kingdom has it not ; and this difference constitutes what is sometimes spoken of as "the circulation of the elements."

Until the other day it could have been said that with the exception of a lowly species called *myxomycetes*, all plants were organisms composed of one, few, or many small masses of protoplasm, separated from each other by partitions of a non-nitrogenous substance called "cellulose," while in animals the protoplasmic particles were not so separated. Quite recently, however, it has been found that in some, and probably in very many if not in all plants, protoplasm is *continuous*, passing by minute filaments from cell to cell, through such cellulose partitions.

With the failure of this differential character, the very last distinction between the two kingdoms, as *ordinarily understood*, falls

to the ground. We must profess ourselves utterly unable to frame any definition which shall at the same time include all kinds of one of these two groups, while excluding all kinds of the other group.

Nevertheless, it is obvious that there is an immense difference between animals and plants generally—a difference well expressed by that common-sense assertion we quoted at starting, that “animals are creatures which get their living by the help of their senses, while plants are senseless.” Now, this common-sense view accords with the distinction drawn so many centuries ago by Aristotle, that animals feel, while plants do not.

In biology, however, groups are characterized by *structure* rather than by *function*, and we know, moreover, that every difference in “function” has some difference in “structure” as its accompaniment. But what is the structure which is related to the function of “feeling”? It is the *nervous system*. “Nervous tissue” is the “organ of feeling,” and modifications of it, with accessory accompaniments, constitute every organ of special sense, *i. e.*, of sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch.

Now, no plant is yet known to possess anything like nervous tissue, and the same may be affirmed of the lowest organisms commonly recognized as animals. We know at present no way of defining a plant save the negative one of saying “a plant is an organism which is not an animal,” while the essence of animal life seems to us to be the power of “feeling,” together with its necessary correlation, the “possession of a nervous system.” If, then, we must draw a hard and fast line between the two kingdoms, we see no way left for us but that of transferring to the vegetal kingdom those lower organisms generally reckoned as animals, which possess no nervous systems. To botanists they will perhaps be an unwelcome present, but they can hardly be refused on any valid scientific grounds. The activity and irritability of many of them are, no doubt, very suggestive of animal life, but so are the activities of some of the lowest organisms always recognized as plants—many of the Algæ, especially in their younger stages and reproductive parts, together with such curious plants of prey as Venus’s fly-trap and its allies—lately referred to.

We do not, indeed, yet positively advocate, though we regard with favor, such a mode of dividing the two component groups which together constitute animated nature; but we confess that we see no possible manner in which these two predominantly diverse groups of organisms can be divided, if the whole mass of living creatures, which we have seen to be so sharply and distinctly separated off from the non-living world, are to be completely, sharply, and distinctly separated, one from the other.

Thus, we venture to think, may at present best be answered the

two questions with which we set out: (1) What animals and plants are, as contrasted with substances which are neither the one nor the other; and, (2) How animals and plants stand towards each other; the answers to which constitute the only reply we know of to the fundamental question we have taken as the title of this paper: "What are Animals and Plants?"

THE ENCYCLICAL "IMMORTALE DEI."

THERE never, perhaps, was a time when clearness of ideas was more demanded among Christian nations than at the present day. Protestantism, which, as its name imports, is a rebellion against God's Church, and, as His Eminence Cardinal Newman has observed, can maintain its position only by asserting that the Church of Rome has gone astray, set up its tribunal of private judgment. That tribunal has called before it every question, religious or moral, with the result of a confusion such that the most ordinary and obvious truths are misapplied, distorted, or rejected, while the most pernicious theories of religion and morality are working havoc among our poor misguided fellow men. It is no wonder this has occurred. At best, as the sacred writer has said: "The thoughts of mortals are timid, and our foresight uncertain" (Wisdom ix., 14). When men deliberately stray away from the fount of living waters, and from the source of truth, they must expect the natural result. Reason, always of its nature liable to err, will then find itself irresistibly driven to conclusions the folly of which will be shown by the practical results. In the midst of the upheaval of society at this epoch, when the masses rise up against legitimate authority, class is arrayed against class, the most sacred duties are disavowed, and the most tender and delicate ties are sundered and the family made desolate, what a blessing to have speak to the world one whose thoughts are not timid, and who, like his Divine Master, gives forth his utterances "as one having authority!" The Encyclical "Immortale Dei," dated All Saints' Day, of the year 1885, is a boon to the world. Not since the Vatican Council has a more important document issued from the pen of the Sovereign Pontiff. Non-Catholics as well as Catholics recognize its truth, its wisdom, its opportuneness, and its eminently practical utility. The liberal press of Vienna was, we

believe, the first to style it "The Covenant between Church and Society." Of course, these journals must have their say, and they, therefore, here and there make their reservations; but those reservations are made lest their expressions of admiration should lead their readers to infer they were about to surrender to the Pope. The London *Tablet* has published a number of extracts from the newspapers of the Continent to show in what esteem the Encyclical is held by those opposed to the Church. As is to be expected, the journals edited by those not of the faith make objection according to their peculiar opinions; but it would be an interesting work to show how, while they do this, the greater number would be found on the side of nearly if not every teaching of the Encyclical. The reason is obvious when we come to review briefly the document in detail.

In a style classic and easy to understand, even by those not used to theological treatment of religious or moral questions, our most Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., comes to the aid of society, and lays down the Catholic doctrine of social life familiar to a Catholic ear, but having a strange sound to the world which habitually refuses a hearing to the Catholic side. The commanding position of the Sovereign Pontiff, however, compels attention, while his personal worth exacts homage even from the proudest men of culture. The effect, therefore, of this Encyclical is apt to be very far-reaching, and it would be a panacea of social ill, were it not that too many of the class Holy Writ tells of, *nolunt intelligere ut bene agant*; do not wish to understand, because they do not want to do what is right.

The first point the Pope speaks of is civil society and authority. We feel it is a pity to curtail these extracts, but the limits of a short article do not permit anything else. In his preamble he says: "No more excellent a manner of establishing and governing a State has been found than that which of its own accord springs from the teaching of the Gospel." How true! Christian charity is the true political economy. The laws of commerce, demand and supply, increase, population, poverty and wealth, would all be the more solid and less liable to error or variation were charity their basis; while the stability of the State founded on the Christian idea of authority would guarantee also the firmness of law of whatever nature.

Authority, the Pope tells us, is from God. Listen to his words: "It is in the very nature of man that he live in society, since he cannot obtain in solitude the necessary culture and ornament of life, and likewise perfection of mind and soul, it has been divinely provided that he should be born for the society and intercourse of men, as well domestic as civil, which alone can supply

the perfect sufficiency of life. Inasmuch, however, as no society can exist unless there be some one to preside over the rest, moving each one by an efficacious and like impulse to the common end, it results that authority by which the civil community of men is governed is necessary; which not otherwise than society itself comes from nature and, therefore, from God. From this it follows that public authority in itself is only from God. God alone is the most true and greatest Lord of all, to whom everything that is belongs, and whom all must serve, so that whoever have the right to command receive it from no other source but from God, the sovereign Prince of all." "There is no authority save from God." How wonderfully clear and logical all this is! What dignity it gives to human society and government! How it safeguards authority, and puts an obligation on every human being to obey the law! The whole of this part of the Encyclical is replete with wisdom, and condenses in a most cogent manner the sayings of the wisest and best men of Christianity. The Pope declares that no special form of government is essential, but that may be taken which fitly secures the common utility and welfare. This, be it understood, must be done with order and with no violation of right. The Pope is no partisan of revolution. He says that those exercising authority must act as the ministers of God, and with paternal charity; to act otherwise is to be a tyrant, for authority is for the common good, and not for the personal benefit of the ruler. On the other hand, those subject to authority must obey. These are his words: "To despise legitimate authority, in whatsoever person it be, is no more allowable than to resist the will of God;" which, if any resist, they go to ruin of their own choosing: "Whoso resists authority, resists the ordination of God; those who resist purchase to themselves damnation" (Romans xiii., v. 2). This official teaching of the Pope is a pledge to our country of the good which will come to it from the Catholic Church. We have the republican form of government, established in a proper orderly manner, and as Dr. J. Gilmary Shea has ably shown, by the cordial and unanimous coöperation of Catholics, from the soldiers of "Congress' Own" to the distinguished signer of the Declaration of Independence, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, and his venerable relative, afterwards the first Archbishop of Baltimore. Every Catholic, the Pope declares, must obey that government. As a consequence the Catholic Church will be found to be the most effective bulwark of American freedom, and of individual rights. Nor need our good fellow-countrymen, bred up in the false ideas of their various creeds, in dread and dislike of Catholicity, fear encroachments on their rights of conscience; for further on the Sovereign Pontiff not only states that princes can tolerate in their

dominions, for just reasons, a difference of faith, but also asserts that the Church is wont to see that no one be compelled to believe against his will, quoting St. Augustine, when he says: "No one can believe except by an act of his will." This act of the will we know is an elicited act, and cannot be forced; otherwise a man would will and not will at the same time the same thing, which is absurd. As for just reasons to tolerate difference of opinion on matters of faith, surely no juster reasons can exist than here among us, where those who differ with us do so in the best of good faith. They will always find us good neighbors and friends, and loyal to the words of the Holy Father which we have just cited. But while the Pope speaks thus with Christian charity, that same Christian charity makes him condemn in outspoken language, for which we are sincerely grateful to him, the doctrine that the choice of one's religion is a matter of indifference; that the various creeds are on an equal footing, and equally safe. He proclaims that only one is the true and safe one, that of the Holy Roman and Apostolic Church; that all are bound to seek in it the means of salvation, and, therefore, to respect and cherish it.

Passing from the consideration of authority in the State and in the Church, and of the good that comes from their mutual good feeling and agreement, the Pope comes to the serious question of revolution as advocated by the secret societies of the present day, and condemns it as it has always been condemned by the Church. And here let us remark, that the secret organization of Masonry, the chief expounder and actor in the propagation of revolutionary ideas in Europe, is entirely out of place in this country and unpatriotic, a menace to our institutions if it were to succeed in spreading its doctrines among us. Americans do not need any dark-lantern work. Let the children of darkness go whence they came, to their place of birth in Europe; they are out of place here. We want education and light, the more the better, not the education which Freemasonry gives without God, but the truth which comes from God, whose light illumines it through the fostering care of His Church. The Head of that Church speaks in unmistakable terms of revolutionary principles. He quotes the documents on this subject given to the world by his predecessors, confirms them, and then sums up. "From these prescriptions of the Pontiffs the following are to be by all means understood: that the origin of public power is to be sought in God Himself, and not in the multitude or people; that the license of sedition (revolution) is repugnant to reason; that it is wrong in men, and wrong in States, to give no place to the duties of religion, or to look on all religions in the same manner; that immoderate power to think and publish one's thoughts is not the right of any citizen, nor is it to be classed

among those things that merit favor and patronage. In like manner it must be understood that the Church is a society, not less than the State itself, perfect in kind and right."

We have referred sufficiently to the first two points of this last passage. The remainder of this article will refer to what the Pope says about the Church in its relation to the State. Once grant that the Church as well as the State is from God; that the Church has her authority directly from God, given to the Apostles and their successors, so that those who hear them hear Him, that this authority is abiding in the Church now as on the Day of Pentecost, and no sane man can avoid seeing that both these societies, the State and the Church, are independent, the one of the other, each in its sphere; but that the State which is constituted for the material order must be second and subordinate to the Church in what relates to the spiritual condition of men, for which Christ constituted the Church. So evident is this that the "Reformers," who found they had to depend on the Rulers of the States they were in, invented a hitherto strange doctrine, that religion belonged to the one who ruled the land, *cujus regio illius religio*. Professor Schaff, in a recent article in the *North American Review*, deservedly and unmercifully scores the slavish condescension of these men who pretended to preach liberty of opinion. They not only made man the slave of kingly power, but enslaved his soul too! And so while the iron heel of the European despotism was stamping out the true faith of Christ from the hearts of poor simple people, the minister stood by and applauded, and bade the people accept what the Prince said they must believe. Degradation of humanity! Was this the conduct of the Popes, and bishops, and priests, and martyrs of the early Christian centuries? No! They gave the people the example of dying for the faith, and bade them die for it. They followed the example of the Apostles, who said: "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts v., 29). In this Encyclical the Pope lays down the law given by Christ: "Give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; but to God the things that are God's." There is no fear of the Church trying to usurp the rights of the State. History shows that the danger is just the other way. The calumny of her enemies has blackened the fair fame of Christ's spouse, who must always defend His interests, and bear the consequences, persecution and calumny. That many questions arise in which the two orders, the civil and religious, meet, comes necessarily from the fact that man has a soul, first subject to God, and then to the State. Those questions, as the Pope ably intimates, can be met by agreements which accurately determine the relations of each order, known as Concordats. Where these are observed, there is no danger of any clash. That such agreements will be needed in this country, where the Church enjoys

the fullest liberty, is not at all likely. It is far more likely that the State, in the possible troubles which may result from the too unrestricted importation of the refuse of Europe, and extension of the right of suffrage, may have to call on the Church to keep her simple people from the delusions of socialism abroad in the land, brought hither by those who learned such principles in the countries that have cast off the "yoke of Rome," or turned a deaf ear to the counsels of the Church. It is such doctrines as these, atheistical literature eminently destructive of society, and such publications as Mr. Comstock so meritoriously wars against, which make Pope Leo XIII. condemn the unbridled liberty of the pen, and society should thank Him for what he has done.

WHAT CAN BE DONE FOR THE ORPHANS?

FROM the earliest organization of Catholic churches in this country, the orphans have been a constant charge, in whose behalf no elaborate appeal has ever been needed. The cause of the fatherless has pleaded eloquently for itself to the benevolence of our people, and no contributions are given so heartily and so ungrudgingly as those made for the preservation of the life and the faith of the little ones whom death has deprived of parents to watch over and guide them.

Beside the efforts made by the parochial clergy and the religious connected with schools to find homes for children reduced to the condition of orphans, efforts by which large numbers are taken into charitable families and cared for, provision is made by the Catholic community to erect and maintain orphan asylums where these helpless children can be received, kept and educated so as to fit them for obtaining a livelihood when they are placed out, and at the same time so grounded in the faith of their parents that perseverance may be anticipated.

Such asylums are found in all our large cities, and scattered through the country, generally at the cathedral cities. The whole number of inmates of the Catholic orphan asylums in the United States seems to be about twenty thousand, although complete returns are not given from all parts; the great cities of Albany, Brooklyn, New York, New Orleans, Philadelphia, and San Fran-

cisco alone maintaining nearly half that number. Exclusive of the money expended in the purchase of land and the erection of the requisite buildings, which in many cases were effected by our forefathers in the faith, the annual amount raised for the support of the orphan asylums by the Catholic body must be something like a million and a half of dollars.

The question of the best means of caring for this large body of helpless ones whom Providence has committed to our trust, and fitting them to earn their own support hereafter, so as to grow up creditably to their faith and their country, is one of no small moment ; but it has not apparently been studied in all its aspects or treated as a whole by any one in authority.

In old communities where there is little change, as in Catholic Canada, the general sympathy for children left orphans leads to their being adopted by some of the kind-hearted neighbors who knew the parents ; and there orphan asylums are scarcely known. Even in cases of epidemics, where numbers of orphans are at once thrown on the charity of the faithful at large, as at Montreal after the ship fever, no asylum was needed, although the orphans and their parents were strangers just landed in the country. At a single appeal from the late venerable Archbishop Bourget every orphan was received and cared for.

With our constantly changing and moving population in most parts of the United States, such a system of adoption is impossible as a general practice, although there is scarcely a parish where this is not done to a greater or less extent. Orphan asylums are generally diocesan institutions, and seldom have accommodations or resources to enable them to receive all who apply. There is sometimes considerable delay when it is undertaken to place an orphan in an asylum, and the clergyman who seeks to obtain admission for the child of deceased members of his parish often finds it easier to secure them a home among his own people, and under his own eye, than to await the action of a distant Board. But this cannot always be done.

Asylums are therefore necessary, and their number increases steadily. There is rarely a case where an asylum has been opened and been abandoned for want of orphans to be received, or of support from the generous sympathy of the Catholic public. The asylums for Catholic orphans in this country are conducted by religious, and therefore at a minimum expense compared to those with paid superintendents, matrons, assistants, and the like. A small number of boys' asylums are under the care of Brothers of the Christian Schools or other similar congregations ; but most of the asylums are conducted by Sisters, the Sisters of Charity being con-

spicuous, as they were the first to undertake this charitable work in our country.

In the immigrant population, diseases acquired on shipboard or resulting from the change of diet, climate, and mode of living, as well as those entailed as a penalty for indiscretion or dissipation, carry off many adults, leaving their families helpless. Where children are born here, the same causes very often make them weakly in constitution, with a tendency to disease. Overwork in the parents in their early struggles often leaves its history in their early death and in feeble children. These classes contribute largely in their proportion of orphans, and those presented for admission to asylums are consequently cases that no life insurance company would regard as good risks. The orphans are therefore more liable than a similar number of children taken at random from the community to a variety of diseases and infirmities. They are generally children of parents weakened in constitution and short in tenure of life. Contagious diseases are apt to spread among them, and, when they once acquire entrance, are difficult to banish from such establishments. Other causes also tend to perpetuate rather than overcome weakness. The order and system maintained gives the inmates less opportunity for exercise and the hardening of the constitution by outdoor employment or amusement that the children would have enjoyed if their parents had lived. Secluded from the world, not even mingling with other children at school, or on the errands on which the children of the poor are constantly sent, these orphans, tenderly cared for and watched over, grow up simple, unsuspecting, ignorant of the world and of the ordinary affairs of life. It is not easy even to give them the ideas of homework that would be acquired by children brought up in the strictest home seclusion. They are thus necessarily inclined to be less robust in body, and liable to be beguiled when they pass from the care of the good Sisters and are exposed to the temptations of the world.

From time to time, as they grow up, orphans are bound out, or placed out, for the old system of apprenticeship is virtually extinct in this country. Then their connection with the asylum virtually ends. The good Sisters are taken up with new-comers; the parishes from which the orphans came have lost sight of them; the associations, often more nominal than real, which manage asylum affairs, assume no further care. Even where attempt is made to follow them up for a time, all trace is soon lost. What becomes of the orphans? There is no place to which they can turn as a home, no place for counsel, sympathy or protection; the asylum cannot take them in again, the Sisters may compassionate many a case and make some exertion, but as a member of a community a Sister

cannot act independently, and can rarely enter into the difficulties of particular cases.

As the average stay of an orphan in an asylum is apparently about six years, every time that term ends twenty thousand Catholic orphans pass out of the asylums into the great busy world, virtually lost sight of by the great-hearted Catholic soul of our people. It does seem that some intermediate institution between the asylum and the world is needed to fit them more practically for the life on which they must enter, and to be a refuge from the world in case of necessity.

In New York city this want has been felt, and an establishment has been founded at some distance from the city where, under the charge of Brothers of the Christian Schools, orphan boys who show an aptitude for any kind of mechanical work learn trades or are instructed practically in farm work so as to fit them to succeed either as mechanics or farmers. The results of the experiment have thus far proved satisfactory, and the boys having acquired some practical knowledge are, of course, more readily taken by employers. This prepares them, indeed, for this one avenue in the future, but does not meet all the cases that occur, or even the majority of them.

As business is now carried on, few mechanics take apprentices, or are permitted by trades' unions to take any, and very few boys or girls are inclined to bind themselves to learn any trade. The factories offer a market for less skilled labor, and quicker returns in wages; boys and girls in great numbers seek employment in them in preference to the slow method of learning a trade. In our large cities at night-fall girls and boys, from the age of twelve years upward, are seen pouring out of tall buildings where manufacturing of various kinds is carried on. The orphan placed at service or to learn a trade sees those of like age thus employed, and eagerly longs to adopt the same course. The temptation is strong, and they easily drift into it, leaving of course the person with whom they had been placed, either surreptitiously or in anger, under either alternative giving no clue by which to trace their future doings. After getting employment they find a boarding-house where they can, and are without any kindly oversight or control.

It is for these, especially the girls, that it seems some species of Home ought to be provided. An establishment under a firm but gentle superintendent to maintain order and system, that would afford board and lodging for the orphans, aid them to obtain employment, advise them as to associates, the proper expenditure of their wages, encourage economy, and check extravagance, would undoubtedly save hundreds. A love of their religion and fidelity in its practice could be more easily kept up. Those awaiting em-

ployment might take part in some kind of work, which would help to pay for their temporary board. The charity of Catholics would be called upon to pay only the expense of the management, and that incurred for those orphans who were received in sickness or in distress. A list of those who year by year leave each Catholic asylum and are transmitted to the Home would help to identify any one applying for admission and save the institution from imposition. The orphans going out into the world would thus feel that they had a home.

Some Catholic may yet introduce a species of charity common in Southern Europe, but as yet unknown here, and that is the practice of establishing a fund, the income of which is given each year as dowries to girls about to marry who can show the best record for industry, virtuous life, and faithful discharge of religious duties. Such a fund for our orphan girls would be a most happy thought, whether connected with an asylum or such a Home as is here suggested.

One of the greatest practical experiments with orphans was that carried out by the present Cardinal Lavigerie soon after he became Bishop of Algiers. Pestilence had swept away thousands of Arabs, and the place was full of orphans. Bishop Lavigerie adopted several hundred of these unfortunate children. He secured a tract of fertile land and placed the children, according to sex, under communities of Brothers and Sisters. As the children grew up they were taught farm work, and some trade, practiced in the country, especially those required in country parts. As they came of age these orphans were encouraged to intermarry, and each young orphan couple received lands, larger for farming and grazing, smaller where the young fellow had a trade, and required only a garden plot and fruit trees. In this way a village of Christian Arabs has been established, entirely free from Mohammedan associations, self supporting, thriving, religious, and happy. The case is one deserving of study, as its lessons may be put in practice in regard to orphans, or to Indian children.

The scheme of Catholic colonization which, under the energetic impulse of Bishops Ireland, O'Connor, Spalding, and others, has attained such magnitude, offers another solution to the question of the best means of advancing the interests of orphan children. As a general rule, an orphan child will do better in a family than in an asylum, except in its earliest years. Now, in these Catholic colonies, boys and girls will not be a burthen, but a needed help, where it is almost impossible to obtain—and what is more, to retain—persons for menial or rural work, either girls for household duties or men for farming labor. If colonies were formed with a direct view to the employment of orphans, it would be well indeed; but it does

not seem that any such step is needed. As these colonies actually are, the Catholic farmers would, doubtless, be only too happy to receive girls who could be trained to household work, who would learn to cook, wash, milk, churn, tend the poultry, and act as nurses to younger children; and boys to aid in all the chores of the house and farm till they could follow the plough and manage horses. These children, being under the eye of the pastor of the settlement, would attend the parochial and Sunday school, and be saved from all temptations against their faith. Their knowledge of the country and the mode of obtaining a livelihood would stand them in stead, and on coming of age they would be prepared to take up lands for themselves, and be able to manage them. Where they were taken into the houses of those who practiced any trade, they would become similarly fitted. Boys showing a readiness at figures and writing would make their way to clerkships, and develop the qualities of business men. The Catholic colonist and the orphan would alike be gainers.

Acting, too, on the plan of the Boland farm, it may be wise to establish a Boys' Asylum near some large city, with competent men to instruct the orphans in market gardening. This is an industry which no Americans seem inclined to undertake, but to which many Germans, Hollanders, and Belgians are thoroughly trained. Their market gardens are found near all large cities on the Atlantic coast, at least from Portland to St. Augustine. Success depends on constant care of each crop of vegetables, and the employment of means to insure the earliest possible vegetables for the market, at, of course, prices much higher than can be obtained when the full crop arrives. An asylum where the boys could be thus trained would have the advantage of being able to furnish a large number to gather small fruits for market. Boys thus trained would always be sure to gain a livelihood, for the competition hitherto has been very slight in this department of industry.

Nor does any reason suggest itself why a Sisterhood should not undertake the cultivation of flowers on a large scale, with extensive greenhouses, training orphan girls to the business. The demand for flowers increases steadily, and the amount of money expended every year in flowers for decoration at festivals, balls, private parties, weddings, funerals, the adornment of churches, and the like, amounts to millions. A convent even of cloistered nuns might well have gardens and conservatories of fine and desirable flowers. There is nothing in the culture and care of flowers that seems incongruous with their secluded and pious life. Still less could any one object to orphan girls being trained under Sisters to this branch of industry. It would enable many girls afterwards to

support themselves, either as cultivators of flowers, as dealers, or in positions where the care of conservatories was required.

With the establishment of homes or training institutions might easily be connected an organization by which reports as to the orphans, or many of them, could be regularly obtained, so that the necessary aid or protection could be extended to them in case of necessity.

In some of the present asylums, not only orphans, properly so called, that is, children deprived by death of both parents, are received, but also children who have one parent living. There are cases where a man losing his wife and compelled to go out to his work cannot possibly look after his children, and must place them in an asylum; as there are widows who cannot carry their children to the place where they work, nor leave them safely. Yet there are cases where the parent will struggle on bravely rather than be separated from the children. Such parents should always be encouraged and aided; for all conversant with the management of asylums know that in a large number of applications by young widows, there is really a lack of parental affection, and that they wish to rid themselves of a burden in order to marry again. They contribute a little for a time and then cease all payment, often disappearing entirely. To receive the children of such heartless mothers is really aiding them to extinguish all maternal instincts and all Christian principles in their hearts. There are cases given where the fact of one parent surviving is concealed and a child placed by misrepresentation in an asylum as an orphan.

The whole subject of half orphans deserves a special study and treatment; but though objects of charity, their condition differs so essentially from that of orphans, that they ought never be allowed to exclude the latter from an asylum, or be received when real orphans are applicants. In their case the closest relations should be kept up between the surviving parent and the child, so as to keep alive the natural bond of attachment; and as soon as the parent can take the child back and give it a home, the parent should be urged to do so. This duty should be constantly kept before the mind of the widowed parent.

The increase in the cost of maintaining orphans in asylums in or near large cities is such that their removal will soon apparently become a necessity, only employment homes being maintained there. This may arise in part from the wish to give these establishments all the modern improvements, and abandon the simpler ways of former days. But in that case we fall into the error of State governments which spend millions on a lunatic asylum, and erect a palace, men being lunatic enough to make such a refuge, though many of those who are to enter it will be farm laborers. The orphans pass to the asylum from an atmosphere of privation and want, to which they

must eventually return, and the asylum life should not be such as to make them on leaving its walls look even to vice as a means of escaping their old surroundings. In 1843 St. Mary's Female Orphan Asylum, Baltimore, maintained 55 orphans at a cost of \$1784.37, or \$32.44 each; in 1884 St. Vincent's Male Orphan Asylum, in that city, maintained 42 orphans, at a cost of \$3373.96, or \$80.33 each. In 1843 the asylum at Mobile maintained its orphans at a cost of \$39.85 for each one; in 1884 the cost of maintaining an orphan in New York city averaged \$84.37. The cost of supporting orphans has thus, it would seem, doubled in forty years. The cost of an establishment is, in addition, all the greater as the number of inmates is smaller. Hence it may soon be a question whether an experiment in some of the rising Western States, on the plan of that made by Cardinal Lavigerie in Algeria, may not be wisely undertaken by several dioceses in concert, and the orphans transferred from the overcrowded East to the labor-demanding West, where, as soon as these wards of the Church are prepared spiritually, mentally, and physically for their life work, they will find a ready field for their exertion. The money contributed by the charity of the faithful will benefit a greater number, the children will gain in strength and in being isolated from the dangers and temptations of large cities, and the asylum from which they emanate will be always nearer to them than now, when many are sent thousands of miles away from the institutions where they have been nurtured. The asylum then would be a refuge or home in case of need.

We have nowhere spoken of orphans as a burthen on the Catholic community. That they must never be regarded; whether they are children of the poor and ignorant, or the children of those who possessed greater culture and moved in a higher sphere of life, where they appeal to us, it is as the wards of the Church, the special trust confided to us by God, to whom we are to minister of the goods whereof He has made us stewards. Perhaps of the two classes, the children of those whose lives have always been a struggle, a precarious battle for livelihood, is less touching than that of the genteel orphans, who shrink from the idea of an asylum, who seem entitled to retain the social place of their lost parents, but who are too sensitive to make known their condition, who tremble at the harsh repulse they fear they may experience from some one silly enough to regard the money in his hands as really his own and not God's, to be used as God wills. Even while writing these lines our interest has been awakened in such a case, two bright, talented girls, daughters of parents both of whom made a name in the field of literature, grandchildren of one whose name was a power. A convent opens its doors to them, as convents often do in similar cases. Catholic charity will, we trust, do the rest.

THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE IRISH QUESTION.

THE result of the late elections for the British Parliament has fully justified the policy of the Irish National Party since the beginning of Mr. Parnell's leadership. It is little over ten years since the present leader of the Irish people first appeared on the scene of politics, and enunciated the line of action on which he held the long struggle of his country for self-government could be brought to a successful issue. The Home Rule party, under the guidance of the late Isaac Butt, had already taken up the task of agitating in Parliament in favor of the universal demand of the Irish people for the management of their own affairs, but to Mr. Parnell and his colleague, Mr. Biggar, must be really ascribed the system of active and fearless parliamentary warfare for that end. With a lawyer's instinct, Mr. Butt dreaded the power of Parliament, while he hoped to awaken its sympathies by respectful pleas for his downtrodden race, and he sharply condemned the rashness of his young follower who threw himself into open hostility with both English parties. Charles Stewart Parnell realized that it was only by a desperate struggle, and at the risk of life and liberty to its champions, that Ireland could win back the self-government which had been wrested from her by force and fraud, and he also realized that such a struggle could be made as well in the halls of a legislature as on the field of battle. Simple as that fact may now appear, it was scarcely apprehended either in Ireland or in England ten years ago. The more enthusiastic and passionate part of the Irish population, especially the young men, could see no salvation for their country save in an appeal to arms, which reflection showed to be, for the time, utterly hopeless on the part of an unorganized and divided population, almost wholly deprived of the use of arms common to every other nation of the civilized world. The more timid part of the population, realizing the latter fact, saw no hope of terminating the system of rule which was rapidly turning their country to a desert, and were ready to despair of the future. The famous obstruction policy of Parnell and his few colleagues, during the debates on the seizure of the Transvaal, first brought home to both the English and Irish people that, in parliamentary as in military operations, a guerilla warfare may break down an enemy of far superior strength. The Irish people began to realize that a minority need not accept the verdict of a hostile majority in meek silence, and that courage, discipline, in-

telligence and hard work on the part of its representatives had a fair chance of winning the object of their desires even against seemingly overwhelming odds in point of numbers. A majority of Home Rule members was elected in 1880, but more than a third of them lacked either courage or honesty to carry out the programme of Mr. Parnell, and thus, for five long years, he was left to carry on the struggle, with little over thirty followers, against the two great English parties, backed by the whole force of public opinion in Great Britain. How effectually he fought it out, the overthrow of the Gladstone government, with its solid majority of over a hundred, is the best proof, and to-day he is about to open a new campaign, with the full force of an almost solid Irish representation, against two parties so balanced that neither can hold the reins of government in the British Empire against his will.

It would be folly to assume that what has been already done means the immediate concession of Irish self-government. That will have to be fought for through many a weary day, in all human likelihood, but it is much that the Irish forces are actually engaged in a campaign for national independence, with a fair prospect of success. The public opinion of the English people is strongly opposed to any concession of self-government to Ireland, and it is only by the most consummate skill that a minority of eighty-six, in an assembly of six hundred and seventy, can hope to make an unpopular cause victorious. Could it be carried out, the suggestion recently made by the *London Times* for settling the Irish difficulty by expelling all Nationalist members of Parliament and putting Ireland under martial law, would be readily adopted by the majority of the English voters of both parties. The utterances of Mr. Chamberlain, the leader of the English Radicals, and those of Lord Salisbury, the Conservative Prime Minister, prove that the feeling against Irish self-government is equally distasteful to Englishmen of the most opposite shades of opinion. To place confidence in the sympathies of any English party would be worse than childish on the part of an Irish statesman. Their fears and interests may bring them to consent to the emancipation of Ireland, but not their sentiments or sympathies. The title of "the huckster nation," applied by Napoleon to the English people, is essentially correct as applied to their public policy to-day. It is only by long and patient efforts that any important concession can be wrung from the British Government. Any concession will be made in the smallest proportions possible to attain its end, and the Irish people must be prepared for a long and bitter struggle during the coming year, before an Irish Parliament can be seen again in Dublin.

Before predicting the probable result of the contest which is sure

to occupy the British Parliament during its pending session, it is all-important to form an accurate idea of what amount of national independence is necessarily included in the idea of Irish Home Rule. With consummate skill, the leader of the Irish people has declined to present any detailed statement of the Irish requirements to the English people. To do so, at the present moment, would simply be to afford an opportunity for English prejudice to commit itself to a determined opposition, before the numerous questions involved can be tried on their merits in Parliament. It would be easy to raise a general cry in England sufficiently loud to scare both parties on the question of Irish independence, while, on the other hand, the various powers, which would make Ireland a self-governing nation, may be, each, accepted in detail. The Irish question, to-day, is a difficulty for English politicians which may, at any moment, become a serious danger, and it is for their interest, not less than Ireland's, to solve it satisfactorily. The Irish people have, again and again, brought forward plans for its solution. O'Connell's Repeal of the Union and Butt's Home Rule programme were both contemptuously rejected, and Mr. Parnell has no mind to undertake the task tried unsuccessfully by his predecessors. He prefers to leave to English ministers to find for themselves what is the nature of the self-government that will satisfy the Irish people, and when they have formed their plan, he will be ready to amend it. The aspiration of the overwhelming mass of the Irish people for emancipation from the form of government now imposed on them is notorious. To get rid of it, they would willingly overthrow the British Empire, if they had the power, and, in the vicissitudes of human affairs, the power may come to them.

“ The patient watch and vigil long
Of him who treasures up a wrong,”

are as dangerous to States as to individuals, and the rulers of the British Empire have good reason, in the present state of the empire, to remove the active feeling of hostility, on the part of the whole Irish race, which now exists. But according to the usual course of English policy, the smallest possible amount of concession will at first be proposed, and in haggling over its terms an immense amount of time will inevitably be consumed. The amount of self-government which alone can satisfy the Irish people is really fixed by the nature of things itself, but it will need long debate to convince the majority of Englishmen that it is not solely dependent on their own good pleasure.

It must be borne in mind, also, that English opinion is not the only factor that requires conciliation in settling the relations between England and Ireland on an amicable basis without a com-

plete rupture of the British Empire. As an abstract question, the great majority of the Irish race would, we believe, prefer a total separation of their destinies from those of Great Britain to any other settlement. The memories of seven centuries of warfare and oppression have burned themselves into the minds of the Irish race, and have made them bitterly hostile to the very name of England. The fact may be regretted, but it cannot be denied. It will need the experience of years of really good government to convince the majority of Irishmen that the connection of their country with England is in any way desirable for them. This is, indeed, a sentiment; but national sentiments are not less of a political force than material resources. In the present century the national sentiment of Spain proved a more terrible foe to Napoleon than the armies and organization of all the great military powers of Europe. A change in the existing sentiments of the Irish race is requisite for a solution of the Irish question in English politics. And such a change can only be effected by establishing a government in Ireland that will satisfy the practical wants and the national self-respect of the Irish people.

The problem of reconciling the practical independence of Ireland with the integrity of the British Empire is thus beset with difficulties on both sides; but though difficult, its solution is not impossible. The civilized world presents numerous examples of different nationalities united under a strong central government, and yet preserving the control of their own affairs in accord with the bent of their national character.

Hungary, Bohemia, and Galicia are united under the sovereignty of the German House of Hapsburg, while each preserves its distinctive institutions, its parliament, and its language apart. Sweden and Norway, with different traditions and constitution, form one power under one sovereign, as far as the rest of the world is concerned. Bavaria, Saxony, and Wurtemberg retain their national laws and native sovereigns in the great military power of the German Empire. In the British Empire itself, Canada and the Australian colonies possess nearly all the attributes of independent States, regulating their whole internal policy in accordance with their own needs and desires. Such an independence as is enjoyed by any of these would, we believe, satisfy the national aspirations of the Irish people, and such an independence would in no way destroy the unity of the British Empire, as far as the world outside is concerned, or prevent the English people from exercising the full control of their own destinies.

The great obstacle to the concession of such an autonomy to Ireland is, of course, the greed of power on the part of the English people and Parliament. The practical gain drawn from Ireland as

a dependency of England, though large, is daily decreasing with the progressive impoverishment of the country, and is, besides, counterbalanced by the necessarily wasteful expenditure required to keep the population in subjection. The desire to keep Ireland weak through fear of possible rivalry, either in trade or in war, is, no doubt, strong among a large section of the English people, but it is not a motive which is very openly avowed. The cry that the integrity of the Empire would be ruined by the concession of Irish Home Rule, is the strongest argument against the latter with the English masses, both in Parliament and outside it. This, too, is, in its way, a national sentiment, but, as a matter of history, the English people has always shown itself much less tenacious of sentiments than of material interests. The latter are not, we believe, very seriously, if at all, involved in the question of Irish Home Rule, and for this reason we believe that its concession is quite within the range of practical politics, provided the forces of the Irish people are steadily directed to that end. The weapon which recent events have placed in the hands of the Irish leader is an eminently practical one. It is the control of the patronage of the Imperial Government which, if he cannot give to his friends, he can take away from whichever party shows itself hostile to the cause he represents. Before such a consideration we are justified in thinking that the politicians of Great Britain will find a means for dispensing with sentimental reasons even stronger than those which confound the safety of the empire with the establishment of self-government in Ireland.

What the essential parts of such a system of Home Rule as will satisfy Irish demands without conflicting with the real interests of England are, may easily be pointed out. The laws regulating the conduct of life, the possession of property, the education of the people, the development of the resources of the country, and, in a word, all the strictly internal management of the affairs of the Irish people in their own country, must be both made and administered by the free will of the Irish people. The well-being of that people must be the main end of its institutions as far as its own intelligence and public virtue can direct them. That it will always direct them to that end in the best possible manner would be to expect too much from human nature. Every government and every people is liable to errors and wrongs in its policy, but it is essential to any genuine self-government of a people that in its own sphere it shall be supreme. Our own system furnishes ample illustration of this fact. A State may run heedlessly into debt, may elect incompetent officials, may pass injudicious laws, yet the central government has no power to check its course while it does not trench on the general Constitution. So it must be in any system that can have a fair

chance of meeting the requirements of the Irish people. They must be left to make their own laws and take the consequences of them untrammelled by any interference, however well meant on the part of the Imperial Parliament. To establish an Irish Parliament, and then require its acts to be ratified by the Imperial assembly, would be simply to perpetuate the present condition of things under a new name. It would be to continue the effort to govern Ireland in accordance with English ideas and English wishes, and that is precisely the system which has been in force during the whole of this century and the failure of which is the reason for granting independent Home Rule.

Several of the suggestions which have been put forward lately by English public men indicate the difficulties which will be raised on this subject. It has been alleged that the existing laws should be maintained in force in Ireland when it is allowed its own legislature, as if a legislature could be such without the power of making or changing laws imposed on it. Again, it is urged that the rights of property must be maintained according to English ideas, by which, it may be presumed, is meant that no legislation should be allowed to regulate the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland on any pretext, though it is admitted that the present state of things is ruinous and cannot be maintained. A third brilliant requirement is that freedom of conscience should be placed under the supervision of the Imperial Parliament, lest, we presume, Mr. Parnell and his co-religionists should be treated as England treated her Catholic subjects down to 1829. Each of these suggestions carries with it its own refutation. Without making a single change in the existing land law, the official valuers, if appointed by the Irish people, could reduce the rental of the whole country to its prairie value by allowing the tenants the value of their own improvements and those of their predecessors in title. Even as it is, the English Parliament finds itself powerless to obtain for Irish landlords rents which the land does not yield, and an Irish Parliament, even if it had the will, would be equally powerless. To establish an Irish Parliament for the redress of Irish grievances, coupled with a strict prohibition to meddle with the same, would seem a folly too gross for belief, yet it has been publicly put forward in the English Press. The fact shows the necessity of insisting on the absolute independence of the Irish Parliament in all matters relating to Irish internal affairs, if it is not to be the veriest shadow of a dream.

The control of the police force is another power which it has been seriously suggested by English statesmen should be reserved to the Imperial Parliament. The absurdity involved in granting the Irish people the right to make their own laws and judges, but re-

fusing them control of the constables employed to carry out the orders of these same judges, does not seem to have occurred to the British public, for the changes have been since repeatedly rung on the police question. In reality the Irish Constabulary system, like the Irish land system, is one of the branches of administration which most urgently require a complete reformation in Ireland, if the public feeling is to be brought into sympathy with the government. Founded on a plan unknown either in England or America, the Irish Constabulary is rather an army of occupation maintained in the interests of the landlord and official classes than a police force. It numbers twelve thousand men drilled in military fashion, and commanded by a staff of officers, under the names of inspectors and sub-inspectors, independent both of the local authorities and of the judiciary, and receiving orders from an Inspector-General in Dublin Castle. The officers are drawn almost exclusively from the anti-national classes, as any manifestation of sympathy with national feelings is regarded by the authorities as a sign of insubordination, and would lead to reprimand or dismissal, as has been shown on more than one occasion. A special precaution to confine the selection of officers to a particular class requires that on their entrance to the force a guarantee must be given by some member of the cadet's family for the payment to him of a private revenue in addition to his pay during an indefinite time. The nomination of candidates is entirely at the discretion of the Lord Lieutenant, and Freemasonry is believed to enter largely into the promotions of the officers. The men are drawn from the general population, but they are invariably sent to counties at a distance from their own families, and frequently changed to prevent their becoming familiar with the people. For them, as for their officers, promotion is chiefly to be gained by zeal against all national movements, whether dangerous to the peace or not. At public or even private meetings of men of national politics, constables are constantly sent to take notes and exercise a surveillance over those present. Police surveillance over individuals, obnoxious to the inspectors or their friends, is another regular branch of their duty; and at evictions large bodies are almost invariably in attendance, whether any resistance is offered to the sheriffs or not. As a police force, in the ordinary meaning of the words, the constabulary are almost useless except in a few of the larger towns; but as a means of making the government hateful to the bulk of the people, the system is strangely and perfectly constructed. Its annual cost, four years ago, was nearly seven millions of dollars, while that of public education barely reached three and a half millions, and the support of the poor throughout Ireland only involved a taxation of five and a half millions. That the continuance of such a system of police should be demanded by leading

members of the late English Ministry as a condition of Irish Home Rule, shows more clearly than a thousand pages of argument the incapacity of comprehending the simplest public affairs in Ireland which prevails among English statesmen.

From the foregoing remarks it may be gathered that no system of Home Rule which involves any interference either of English Ministers or of the Imperial Parliament can satisfy the wishes of the Irish people. The concession of elective county boards, partial reforms in the land laws, or allowing a national assembly to exercise the powers now entrusted to some of the numerous "Boards" that constitute the executive government of Ireland, would be useless in reconciling the minds of the Irish race to the English connection. For them a change of government, come it either within the British Empire or from its dismemberment, is a necessity. Under the combined load of foreign rule, excessive taxation, exorbitant rents, and administrative stupidity, the Irish nation is simply perishing. We have heard an Irish Viceroy, Lord Carlisle, boast, over twenty years ago, that during a still shorter space three hundred and sixty thousand cabins had been swept away from the face of Ireland; manufactures have disappeared one by one, and no sadder sight can be seen by the visitor to Ireland than the walls of the now empty factories and mills which meet the eye in every part of the island. The lands once cultivated have been turned to pasture, and much has relapsed to the barren morass or hill-side from which it had been reclaimed by the toil of the peasants whose cabins have been swept away by the evictor. Forty years ago six millions of acres were cultivated; to-day there are little over five. Every province, Ulster as well as Connaught, has shared in the general ruin, and, indeed, during the decade ending in 1881 the decay of people and wealth was proportionally greater in Ulster than in any other province. The fisheries have dwindled to one-sixth of what they were in 1848, and while the revenues are squandered with a lavish hand on a useless constabulary and a horde of worse than useless officials, the trifling outlay which would provide harbors and piers for the poverty-stricken fishing population of the West, and the want of which exposes them constantly to losses beyond their power to repair, is refused by official arrogance. While every other country in Europe has progressed during the last forty years, the population of Ireland has shrunk from eight and a quarter millions to less than five. The Turk has long been the symbol of misgovernment in the eyes of the civilized world, but no part of the Turkish Empire has experienced such a decay as has fallen on Ireland under the rule of constitutional England. To stop the progress of that decay even now, to remould the institutions of the country, so that its people may live

and thrive on its soil, to protect the life, liberty, and property of every Irishman, whether he be rich or poor, Saxon or Celt, and whether he loves his own land better than her foreign ruler or not, this is the essential condition to any reconciliation of the Irish race to the connection with England. Such a result can only be brought about by an Irish Legislature vested with the full and untrammelled control of Irish affairs within the bounds of Ireland..

Though it may cost a sacrifice to English pride, and still more to English race prejudice, thus to renounce all interference with the domestic policy of Ireland, it is not, in truth, a very serious material sacrifice. The money squandered on the official supporters of the government in Ireland is a burthen to the resources of Ireland, but it adds little to the comfort or prosperity of the English people. A contented and prosperous Ireland connected with the Empire by a common government for foreign affairs, for military and diplomatic service, and for the central executive presiding over these branches, would be an important addition to the strength of the empire in the complications which are sure to arise in the troubled political atmosphere of Europe. The transfer of Irish governmental business from the Parliament in Westminster to one in Dublin, would enormously increase the utility of that body for the home administration of England and the management of foreign affairs. The want of time to attend to the general concerns of the empire has become a constant complaint against Parliament, and several of the costly mistakes of recent years might have been avoided if the attention of Ministers had been free from the cares of the Irish question. The annexation of the Transvaal and the Zulu war, with its cost of thirty million dollars, and its series of ignominious disasters, the still more costly and unsuccessful campaigns in Afghanistan, with their outlay of over a hundred millions, and the dishonor and expense of the Soudan expedition, are a few specimens of the dangers which may any day follow from mistakes in policy in an empire like that of Great Britain. The closest attention is needed for the administration of a dominion extending to every quarter of the globe, and defended by a force which is insignificant beside the armies of every great European power. Yet, year after year, the greater part of the time of both ministers and Parliament is consumed in the ungrateful and hopeless task of misgoverning Ireland. The administrative power of the empire is wasted in the effort, as was the strength of Napoleon in the Spanish invasion. To stop that waste and increase the active work of the executive and legislature would be an enormous practical gain for England; but that can only be done by such a concession of self-government to Ireland as we have already indicated.

As to the connection with the Empire which Ireland would

accept, and which might satisfy all reasonable wishes of the English people for maintaining the integrity of the empire, it does not seem that any insurmountable difficulty need occur. The precedents of Canada and Australia prove that English public opinion can be brought to relinquish administrative control over parts of her dominion under pressure of necessity. The national prejudices are, no doubt, more strongly opposed now to Irish self-government than they were to self-government in Australia or Canada; but then, too, the motives which suggest its concession are much stronger. The details would necessarily be different. Ireland now bears a share in the burdens of the empire which was never borne by the colonies, and she will be doubtless required to bear it still. If skilfully adjusted, we do not believe that the burden would be too great, but, on this point, we are not perfectly certain. At the date of the Union, the resources of Ireland were estimated as bearing the relation of between one-eighth and one-ninth to those of England. At present, judging by the income-tax returns, the amount of the public debt held in the two countries, and the value of railroads in each, the wealth of Ireland is about one-twentieth that of England, while her contributions to the imperial taxation are about one-tenth of the whole. There is little doubt but the large relative increase in Irish taxation (sixty-eight per cent. in Ireland as against seventeen in England since the Russian war) has been one of the causes of the unexampled national decay alluded to already. With an intelligent government and a complete reform of the present administration, she might bear the load; but, on that point, we are by no means certain. One thing is sure, and that is, that the Irish taxpayers should reap the benefit of any economies that can be effected in their own administration; such, for instance, as in the constabulary expenditure, the vice-regal court, and the overpaid legal officials. The question of separate custom-houses, and the establishment of an Irish protective tariff, is one which, in the present free-trade policy of England, will excite considerable opposition; but, for ourselves, we are not inclined to believe it essential that such a right should be granted, though it would be highly desirable, as removing unnecessary interference of English or Imperial officials in the Irish government. Internal licenses might furnish protection, if needed, to Irish products, without interfering with the customs. Perhaps the most feasible solution of the question of imperial taxation would be a separate budget for the expenses connected with the central government, such as the army, navy, foreign and diplomatic service, the public debt, and the civil-list of the sovereign. The taxes necessary to meet these expenditures might be levied on particular branches of the revenue, either internal or external, applied uni-

formly to both countries, which would thus share in the common burdens in proportion to their respective wealth. The special expenditures of both England and Ireland might then be met at the judgment of their own representatives by additional imposts in any form they might deem most suitable. The taxes on certain articles might thus be exclusively reserved for Imperial purposes, leaving both England and Ireland, through their respective representatives, free to tax themselves in any way they pleased for their own domestic expenditure.

It should not be anticipated, however, even though the material difficulties in the way be not insurmountable, that they will be speedily disposed of. First in the House of Commons, and again in the House of Lords, we may expect to hear the time-worn charges against the whole Irish people repeated again and again during the coming session of the British Parliament. It is more than likely, indeed, that most of its time will be consumed, as that of many former sessions has already been, in endless debates on the Irish difficulty, in its new form of a powerful third party holding the balance between the two, which look on the government of the Empire as their own property. The Irish race must be prepared for a long-enduring struggle before it can hope for final success. It may be better that it should be so. In political life, as in war, real success is only to be won at the cost of sacrifice and by the practice of patient discipline. A vigorous campaign in a hostile assembly will be an invaluable training-school for the future statesmen of Ireland, if they are faithful to their task and fearless in its execution. It is better that every objection to Home Rule in its true sense should be threshed out in the British Parliament beforehand, than that that body should concede the boon in hot haste, only to seek to minimize it by subsequent interference with the action of the Irish Parliament in its own affairs. If the contest be carried on vigorously and wisely, every day of it will be an additional argument with thinking Englishmen against future interference in the affairs of Ireland. It is the nature of such a struggle to weary out and disgust the side which has nothing to gain, and that side is not assuredly the Irish one. The Irish people and their leader have already experienced the worst of English animosity, and, short of utter extermination, they have little more to fear. A sudden move of Russian forces on the Himalayas may any day remind England by how slender a thread her empire hangs together, and cause a revulsion of feeling in favor of securing an Irish alliance, such as is now being experienced on a smaller scale by the leaders of her great parties. "We bring two mighty deities with us," said the Athenian commander of old, when he sought to extort tribute from a Grecian island, "Force and Argument, and you will do well to

pay heed to them." "We admit their might," replied the beleaguered garrison, "but we too have two awkward protectors, Necessity and Poverty, and with their aid we will bide your attack." The Irish people to-day have the same allies as the Naxian islanders had against the power of Athens. They cannot abandon the fight, and they have no spoils to reward their conquerors, while England, with the power, has also the weakness of overgrown and worshipped wealth. The contest will be a long and stubborn one, and it would be premature to chant victory before the battle is fought; but if the Irish people and their representatives continue the struggle as they have maintained it during the last five years, sooner or later we may fairly hope for full success, and that Ireland shall be

"A nation once again."

THE SUPERNATURAL¹ AND INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT.

NOT many years ago, a writer of no mean acquirements, as a man of science and a historian, stated in one of the leading English Reviews that the result of religious belief on mankind, wherever that belief had had any influence whatever, had been "to sap the foundations of patriotism, to eradicate the moral instincts, and to stunt intellectual growth and development"—and for proof of his statements he appealed to history. The matter, he seemed to think, was one of most profound simplicity, and he made very short work of it. The details of this singular account have naturally no need of criticism; nor would it be consistent with our purpose to examine their value here. If we mention them at all, it is only because they constitute the opinion generally of the modern school of progress. And not only is this opinion one among their many dogmatically expressed judgments, but is really implied in all of them; and it is being accepted on all sides more or less consciously, and being repeated on all sides with more or less emphasis.

As long as such vulgar confusion on such an important point continues, as long as the mind of the age remains blind to one of the most fundamental and, one would think, one of the most obvious truths that history can furnish, so long will a true calculation

¹ It may be well to remind the reader that the term *supernatural* in the following paper is used not in the old Scholastic, but in the modern Agnostic sense.

be impossible of the prospects before humanity. The scope of the present paper will be to point and to direct, by a necessarily rapid and superficial historical review, the attention of thinking men to what was once considered a truism, to what is now complacently set down as a lie, and to what will, we hope, in a more lively way than ever, be by and by rediscovered as a truth. We will attempt to indicate that religious belief, so far from having had no influence, or an evil one, has really moulded all intellect and shaped all conduct that is distinctly human or distinctly civilized. And it would be no difficult task to show that religious belief is essential to all the hopes of those who are loudest in their outcry against it; that it is comprised not only in our conceptions of private character, but in the most advanced and liberal views of political and social progress. Of this assertion the annals of art, and of science, and of literature, afford the most complete confirmation. Nor can any one be deceived in this matter by an appeal to isolated historical facts, selected with no other aim, either in the choice or in the interpretation, than to support a forefixed bias or a foregone conclusion. For what we would wish to insist on here is not that our scientific sociological theorists are ignorant of history in the sense of being little acquainted with historical literature, though this too of many of them might, we conceive, be said with truth; the failure we attribute to them is something more serious. It is not that they have not advanced far enough in one field of inquiry, but that they have advanced no way at all in another; they may be foremost among those who know, or the most ignorant of all, with regard to *what* has happened in the history of the world, but in no fruitful way have they ever questioned *why*?

But, first, let us state more distinctly the exact bearing of our argument, the precise positions we desire to prove and disprove, and the definite schools or parties against whom what we shall have to urge shall be directed. These last, to designate them broadly, may be termed, in inconvenient if not new language, the school of Agnosticism: and the term will include more than it at first sight seems to do. For an Agnostic is not only one who denies simply that the supernatural has exerted any influence on the intellect of man, but who besides asserts that, supposing it to have exerted an influence, that influence has been evil. The Lucretian doctrine that religion is the "chief curse and prime affliction of the world," is asserted in positive terms by the doctors of Agnosticism.

And this brings us naturally to the matter now in hand. As the Agnostic school have treated philosophy, so have they treated the use of the supernatural. Let us take an instance. Let us take the doctrine which they claim as peculiarly their own, and which is so essential to their prophetic progress, and apply to it the tests

according to which all such development, whether intellectual, moral, or social, is, we are told, to be guided. The issue, to the Agnostic optimist, must, one would think, be surprising. The doctrine of the Rights of Man, for example, will be seen to have been founded on the supernatural. As mankind have hitherto professed it, it was essentially a theistic doctrine, a doctrine founded on the immortality of the soul: the belief in the rights of man connoted belief in a God who gave a sanction to those rights. As tried at the judgment seat of calm knowledge and sober intellect, the social part of this doctrine relies on the religious, not only for its support, but for its meaning. This was always its implied basis and generally its explicit one. It was on this Robespierre founded his extravagant Declaration; it was on this Saint Simon rested his visionary hopes and impossible schemes; while it can hardly be necessary to remind the American reader that it was on this that the whole case rested against slavery as slavery, and that it was these beliefs and these arguments that made the suppression of slavery not only possible to accomplish, but possible even to conceive or to wish for.

Now, how are the doctrines of this modern school modified by their rejection of the supernatural? To this the answer can be at once exact and final. Discrediting the old proofs of their truth, by detailed demonstration, as is thought, of their falsehood, rejecting the only conceivable foundation on which the beliefs in question have till now rested, modern Agnosticism is accomplishing, at once theoretically, and by and by will accomplish practically, the very reverse of all that their profuse prophecies of unlimited progress imply. And, first of all, let us take the example just brought up—man's equality. The economy of the Catholic Church builds up an absolute equality in salvation that comprises or can comprise, indiscriminately, all mankind. *Modern Science* disowns such equality. This, however, is but half the truth. It insists that they are unequal—and it does so with a harshness and a completeness of meaning that, till our day, was inconceivable. The brutality to his subjects of no oriental tyrant, the disdain of barbarians of no Grecian philosopher, ever implied this inequality so fully as modern science explicitly declares it. Its whole aim and drift is to prove with increasing insistence that each man is the creature of his education and surroundings; that of his distinctively human value his body is the cause and the measure, and that not only are men's seeming inequalities real, but that in reality they are greater than they seem. No spiritual instinct or insight can pierce through and discover beneath the surface some common greatness, some treasure shared equally by all—for no

such treasure exists—but man is left the plaything of fortune, the child of circumstance.

In view of these two great defects in the dominant philosophy, its want of generalization, its utter inability to apprehend the bearing of events on each other, and its tendency to reject the supersensual, the unseen, the spiritual, it cannot be surprising to any one that it should be reluctant to recognize the supernatural as an important factor in intellectual development. For the empiricism that meanwhile reigns is, on the one hand, so curiously without historical sense, and so indifferent to historical method, that it seems unable either to conceive or to represent any supernatural force, either in its organic growth and completeness, or in its historical relation and significance; and on the other hand, its attitude towards supernatural phenomena is, if we may borrow a term from medicine, so purely *pathological* that it treats and deals with a fact as old and as universal as man, as a product of disease rather than health. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the various forms of empiricism—agnostic, skeptic, positivist—are all marred by the same original blot, marked by the same fundamental incapacities, and can as little explain the origin and progress of intellectual development as they can of themselves. Loudly proclaiming their great passion to find and formulate a science of history, they have hitherto been blind to the meaning of the great historical faiths, and have been unable to tell how they sprang, why they were or are, or what purpose they served. To ask these questions is to recognize an ideal significance in religion and an ideal purpose in the mechanism of this world that were fatal to any system whose first principle is to dispense with an ideal cause and presence in the universe. And hence, the philosophy that does not rise and end in the supernatural is a sapless, withered rationalism; its reason is like an eyeless socket, vainly illumined by the sun.

As with philosophy, so is it with literature. Literature will lose just as much as philosophy. "All its sublimity, its brilliance, and the great part of its interest depend on the idea of the supernatural, and would, in its absence, be absolutely unproducible." The aim of the supernatural—to change a living writer's metaphor—is, indeed, to make the soul a musical instrument which may yield music either to itself or to others at any appulse from without; and the more intense and real the idea is, the richer and more composite can this music be. Without the supernatural literature is like a simple pastoral pipe that will produce but one melody, and that not an elaborate one, rather a "deep andante moving in a bass of sorrow," which rolls so mournfully through the writings of our "modern galaxy of tuneful anarchists and pantheistic bachelors."

The grandest conceptions of the mind have their source in religious convictions. What is it that gives intensity to our thoughts, as a presence becomes awful when shrouded or enlarged, as vastness, or height, or depth is expanded towards the Infinite? Is it not that we recognize an existence higher than the natural? The tenderness and delicacy of the Hindoo epics evince it; the grandeur and sublimity of Greek poesy testify to it; the Holy Scriptures, the richest inheritance of the ages, prove it; and the response of the human mind demonstrates it. From the conditions of the mind and the imagination there arises for man a new world, a new order of being, which is recognized by every race and every age. This conception of the supernatural pervades every department of literature; it intrudes on the domain of painting and sculpture; it guides the imagination through the land of reverie and romance, and reigns unquestioned in the realms of poetry and philosophy. The highest culture serves but to grace it with every delight of fancy and refinement, and the grossest ignorance produces but a deplorable, fantastic exaggeration.

In earliest ages every forest and glen was the home of nymph or fawn; all nature was animate with invisible genii. The poet loved to sing of their graceful forms and people harsh nature with lovely images. It was a beautiful thought; and Grecian poetry still whispers it in our delighted ears. But in the oriental mind, these ideas attained a more complete development. The Arabian Nights contain the wildest flights of human imagination; the laws of nature are entirely disregarded; the natural blends with the supernatural, and space itself is thickly inhabited. Wizards, fiends, shipwrecked sailors, and wandering princes hurry across the stage; stately palaces, enchanted castles, and sumptuous mystic caverns meet our view; and fairies, furies, sultans, and beggars appear and disappear like the figures in a kaleidoscope. They are the dreams of the opium-eater, light, airy, and fantastic like the mosque and minaret beneath whose shadow they spring into existence.

It is merely stating an exact truth to say that poets to be great must be Christian. But Homer and Hesiod, Sophocles and Euripides, Æschylus and Pindar were great poets! True; but they had instincts and mental tendencies identical with those of Christians. They had a reverence for the spiritual world and divine authority. They never dreamed of atheism, agnosticism, materialism, or rationalism. It may, indeed, be urged that the great men, the cultured, representative men of old refused to credit much of the popular belief. It must be remembered that the supernatural in the ancient world of Paganism was something exceedingly unsettled and intermediate, and our classical divinity, though, of course, to some extent, an embodiment of it, does, in reality, em-

body but a very small part. Zeus and the minor gods of Olympus were vaguely conceived to be surrounded by some deeper mystery which, to the popular intelligence, was altogether undefined, and which even such men as Xenophon and Plato could only describe by extraordinarily confused and inadequate concepts.

The supernatural was a twilight, dim and diffused, but Christianity has brought it to a focus, and collected and concentrated the scattered rays that before were altogether imperceptible. "That vague 'idea of the Good' of which Plato said most men dimly augured the existence, but could not clearly express their augury, has been given a definite shape to by Christianity in the form of its Deity," the father of the human soul, and its arbiter, and what is incomparably more, its final rest, its delight, its desire. In the light of this thought, man stands out a vaster being, and every detail in the life of a human soul becomes more important beyond all comparison, unspeakably more momentous than the myriad worlds around. Ancient pagan literature had its supernatural, exercising a very potent influence on the grandest intellectual products of the age. The forms under which it was conceived were, it is true, most inadequate and most false; but through the depraved and dusky form there are certain to come beams of eternal truth, broken and scattered, straggling and refracted, by the intervening prisms of ignorance and error, but beams still that can help to interpret the universe, which, viewed through the most approved medium of the philosophy of matter, is but an infinite blank wall, confronted by an ignorance that never looks so hopelessly imbecile as when it pretends to be knowledge.

And now we feel no reader will find it irksome to accompany the "star-quenching angel of the dawn," as he travelled, nearly seven centuries ago, "with broad, slow wing from the Levant to the Pillars of Hercules, and from the summits of the frosty Caucasus across the Alpine ridges to the dark nakedness of the western isles," and resting on the sweet quiet bosom of the Bay of Naples, view the softest sunrise that ever lit up the east, or view the most gorgeous sunset that ever sank below the west. Our purpose, however, will carry us farther north. Let us leave, then, sweet Naples, pass by Rome with its classical antiquity, stop but a moment at ocean-born Venice, "rising with her tiara of proud towers," and keep on our way to the capital of France, to Paris, the fountain of fashion and the seat of science. Collected together in this splendid city, from England and Germany, from Italy and the East, was the highest that could be found at that day of courage, eloquence, and learning, the flower of chivalry, the depth of science, troubadours and minstrels, wits and beauties. Here were fostered the disciples of Averroës, the most celebrated of Arabian philosophers;

astrologers from Bagdad, with their loose garments and flowing beards; and Hebrews, learned and sedate, the interpreters of the hidden wisdom of precious manuscripts brought over from Arabia; learned professors of Humanities and Rhetoric, mature and masterly doctors of Philosophy; while men of profound scholarship poured forth the wealth of their accumulated learning in the University chairs of Theology. Let the reader fancy, if he can, the agitation that prevailed in Paris on the 23d of October, 1257, when the two noblest children of St. Francis and St. Dominic—Bonaventure and Thomas of Aquin—were to make their “public act” for the highest academical honors. Whoever knows anything of academical life, of doctors and lecturers, of students and professors, of those whose life labors are spent in unwavering devotion to literature and learning, and of the texture of their minds, can paint for himself a picture of the excited preliminary debates in the very streets of the University town, as men gathered in groups and bands to discuss and canvass the probable issue of the coming intellectual joust. He will see the long files of Dominicans—clothed in their religious habit that seems to blot out all idea of sensual admiration and carries away the mind into a loftier sphere, a higher range of thought, where beauty of far nobler sort finds congenial habitation—advancing from their convent, *L'ancien St. Jacques*, with elastic tread, and a perceptible expression of satisfaction, as they pick their passage through students, professors, and wondering crowds, towards the episcopal palace, where they will see their brother Thomas receive his ring and cap. The children of St. Francis, too, clad in their habit of coarse brown serge, girdled with their knotted cord, move somewhat more rapidly than usual their sandaled feet to witness Bonaventure display his wondrous knowledge before the assembled learning of Europe.

To defend a wide field of theological and philosophical truth before such an assembly and against the longest and keenest heads and the most skilful and practiced dialecticians, against well-seasoned professors and the *élite* of every Faculty, required a stout heart, a clear intellect, and an imperturbable coolness and self-possession which the pigmy intellects of our day, in spite of their endless boasting of enlightenment, and inane insistence on progress and originality, could never furnish.

Seated in their chairs on a raised platform, in view of the whole multitude, sit solemn and majestic the authorities of the University—the highest exponents of learning in the then civilized world—arrayed in the various robes symbolical of their various offices, and the different insignia representative of their different degrees: Bishops and Doctors of Divinity; Jurists and Canonists; Rectors and Provosts; Masters and Bachelors; Superiors of Religious

Houses and Generals of Religious Orders; the secular element and the regular; the gown and the hood, all are represented. Nor were the different ranks of the clergy alone in manifesting their interest in the approaching spectacle. Doubtless there was many a gallant knight and many a roguish varlet, many a thriving merchant and many an honest bourgeois, many a sturdy artisan and bright minstrel, many a noisy *jongleur* and witty singer of canzonets, who would willingly join himself to the joyful crowd that flowed uninterruptedly towards the palace, assured that his trouble would be overpaid to hear Thomas of Aquin "pour forth his wealth of learning, his novelty of proof, his calm eloquence, his divine fire, his inimitable simplicity, that had filled the world as it had never been filled before, and that now would be called forth in all their splendor as the Great Master makes his solemn act, performs the '*grand tour de force*,' in which he will be obliged to display what he ever so modestly tried to conceal—the wide circumference of his knowledge, the matchless grace of his dialectical skill, and the full swing of his gigantic intelligence."¹

Men were not startled in those days as they are in these by the unusual deeds and privileges of chosen souls. Conscious of the supernatural, they took God's work for granted. They believed what they saw; they did not pry, and test, and examine, and lose their souls. Generally, they got nigher the truth than we do. Their minds were not scaled and corroded by false science. Much ignorant rhetoric is poured out in these days upon the great theologians, philosophers, and teachers of the Middle Ages. One writer pilfers the platitudes of another and parades them before the public—the public which never hardly has the time or the inclination to read the originals for themselves, or to study the real current of events.

The Scholastics, like all men, were not faultless; their system can be criticised. But one thing is certain: they were no mere "snowy-banded, delicate-handed, dilettante" performers. Science and education absorbed their whole strength, and occupied the most precious portion of their lives. They were, generally, men who had abandoned this world out of love for the next. They had something noble and heroic in their spiritual make to start with. They passed their days amid grand ideas; their convictions and their lives were above the earth. St. Thomas of Aquin was the living embodiment of the influence of the supernatural in moulding the mind. He belongs to the highest order of human greatness; a student, a contemplative, and a thinker, possessing the most architectonic mind the world has ever seen. In him the intellect reigns supreme; and not only is he supreme in intellect, but the calibre

¹ Life and Labors of St. Thomas of Aquin.

of his mind, its depth, exactness, and balance, its rapidity, splendor and strength, class him with Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle; while his illumination through grace, the influence of the supernatural, and the knowledge acquired by the light of revelation, at once lift him to a more eminent position than could possibly have been attained through the power of mere human genius and unassisted reason.

It is difficult to comprehend how the life of any of the great mediæval giants can be thoroughly appreciated by the mind of an educated man, leaving out of calculation the prodigious influence which the supernatural has exerted in moulding his intellect and influencing his personal opinions. Still less can any adequate estimate which would seek to compute the reach of moral principle and the influence of saintly genius be formed, without embracing a considerably wider range of thought than would be to our purpose, aiming, as we have done, at a short and somewhat desultory paper, rather than at displaying the genesis and development of truth and the impress of a master-mind upon his age. It has always appeared to us that the most telling influence, the most pregnant and momentous mastery exerted by the great saints of the Catholic Church has been that of rare mental ability and power in confronting and controlling the passionate prejudices and mental aberrations of maddened epochs, as well as of blinded, swerving men. Their unassuming piety, their stainlessness of conscience, their faith in the spiritual, their delightful self-distrust, their ingenuous simplicity, their God-like unselfishness,—all these form, as it were, the fountain head whence their far-reaching influence shoots. Keen apprehension of reason, sober judgment, penetrating discrimination, vivacity of mind and undeviating rectitude of will, what are they but the manifestations of a highly cultivated moral nature, and the instruments God-given and God-fashioned for carrying into execution some extraordinary purpose of Providence?

It seems to us that the intelligent student of history must conclude, as there unfolds to his mind the many-sided influence of heroic sanctity when manifested by a man of massive mind, of sovereign genius, and of sagacious judgment, that firmness of command, steadiness of view, and unswervingness of purpose are naturally conditioned by a certain supernatural moral constitution of head and heart; that the four outgrowths of the supernatural,—purity, reverence, adoration, love,—are the four corner-stones on which that premonitory beacon, that intellectual Pharos reposes, which, when all around and far beyond it is darkness and confusion, stands up in the midst of the tempest, the emblem of peace, the symbol of order, the minister of light, the token of safety.

Let us briefly sum up here the conclusion we wish to draw, and

which what we have said will, we think, fully justify. The great works of antiquity are distinctly traceable to the influence of the supernatural. To the use of the supernatural Æschylus owes his most startling scenes and most lofty conceptions. It pervades the poetry of Homer and Hesiod, and exerts its influence through the pages of Pindar, Sophocles and Plato. And not the Greeks alone, but the highly-colored and exciting thought of all the East, the philosophical mysticism of Egypt, and the opium dreams of India. The same emotion that agitated the breast of Homer, as he felt the sublimity of his grandest conceptions, made the wheels of Juggernaut welcome to the Hindoo devotee. Then, fixing the thirteenth century as a standpoint in the Middle Ages, we shall find the supernatural ranging up and down, from the most rapt speculations of St. Thomas to the most vigorous action, from the ecstatic transports of Dante, as his eyes behold the glories of heaven, to his melancholy cries of horror as his ears are smitten with the groans of misery from the infernal torture-house which he reveals. Such is the character of the supernatural, and in its wondrous influence is manifested the power which it exerts in moulding the human mind. It expands the mind beyond the limits of the finite, and whispers a thought of Him who is Infinite—Eternal. It speaks throughout all ages the eternal protest of spirit against matter. Who can estimate the influence it exerts? Ever saying to man, "There is a world beyond the present," ever hinting to his mind the hope of eternal life, it has stood, a steadfast bulwark of truth, and, through centuries, has fashioned the intellect and influenced the opinions of mankind.

We know that in the style of to-day we ought hardly venture to so much as mention the word poetry, unless we be prepared to unfold and display the mysterious beauty and hyperbolic inspiration of some recently developed child of "light and sweetness." We confess at the outset that we have no such exhibition to offer. We do not intend making a rhetorical study of our late poetry as works of art, though this, we conceive, might not be without alarming consequences to many ridiculous impressions and current opinions, and might decidedly cheapen our estimate of much of it. Our design at present, however, is an altogether different one. In glancing rapidly at a few of our modern English poets, we do not pretend that their verses are not good verses. On the contrary, we think most of them ingeniously conceived, as musical and as graceful as the verse of any age in our history.

But there lies this original blot on every product of our modern academic poets of the cultured school of *ennui*, that, repudiating the elevating influence of the supernatural, and limited to the merely visible world, they are bound to make the most of it; to dwell on

its magnificence, to analyze its beauty, to make it the illimitable theme of wonder and admiration. Nature, indeed, as our forefathers understood and interpreted it, was always bursting forth into a great orchestral hymn of praise to the Creator, such as Dryden fancied in the very process of evolving cosmos out of chaos:

From harmony, from heavenly harmony
This universal frame began;
From harmony to harmony
Through all the compass of the notes it ran,
The diapason closing full in man.

Now our modern Agnostic poets are always striving to give to the creature the glory which this "shining frame" proclaims the due of the Great Original; and with audacious blasphemy they announce the death of God and the fetichistic apotheosis of man.

And the love-song of earth, as Thou diest, resounds through the wind of her wings,
Glory to Man in the highest! for Man is the master of things.

The unmitigated, diabolical wickedness of such a sentiment is a sufficient apology for the citation.

Now, this poetic deification of Nature is the choice of certain facts for the sake of their beauty and their sublimity. It deliberately sets aside multitudes of other facts that are not beautiful, and yet are very real. Deep is our debt to the magicians who have exhibited to us the world radiant and harmonious. It is an ideal of priceless value, precious and invigorating to spirit. But it is not the real truth, or rather not the whole truth—far from it. The world is quite as often wild and discordant. In thought we generally see but the bright side, but stern reality, hard fact, brings us face to face with the dark side. We need as little think this world all beauty as think it all horror. It is made up of both, of loveliness and ghastliness, of harmony and discord, of agony and joy, of life and death. The nature-worshippers, incapable of seeing a higher purpose in it all, are blind and deaf to the death-struggles and shrieks which meet at every turn the seeker after truth. Of course, to express feeling in such beautiful, or sublime, or humorous forms as may strike the sense with admiration, overwhelm it with awe and astonishment, move it to uncontrollable pity, or scorn, or laughter, is the aim of the artist, working, whether in color, or in light and shade, or in marble, or in speech, or in song. And sympathy with all the inner teaching of nature may be fresh and vital truth in the form of immortal art. No wise one of us would willingly despise the faintest thrill of it, or lose a

verse from that magnificent psalmody of nature, which from Tyr-tæus to Tennyson is one of the best gifts that genius has bestowed on man. Our love of this rich and potent earth, our awe at this mysterious system which peoples space with a marshalled host of worlds, our sense of the profound unity and harmony of the mighty mechanism, are now transfused and enlightened by all the insight of all the poets, from Job and the Royal Hebrew bard, and Homer and Theocritus, to Shakespeare and Wordsworth, together with all the thoughts of the philosophers from Pythagoras, Aristotle, and Plato, to St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and the other mighty minds who saw in it not the wild working of ungovernable chance, but the purposed outcome of a perfect and almighty will.

But after all, this worship of nature is but one side even of poetry, and that not its grandest. No poets have surpassed in this field the greatest in the ancient and in the modern world. Homer, the poet of the sea; Shakespeare, the poet of the air, he who saw the "floor of heaven thick inlaid with patines of bright gold." And yet in Homer, as in Shakespeare, the worship of nature holds but a subordinate place. To these great minds, the "folds of many-fountained Ida," "the waste of hoary brines," "the moonlight sleeping on the bank," the "morn walking over the brink of some high eastern hill," are but the frame wherein are set their pictures of living men and women and societies; of passions, sufferings, character; of hope, despair, love, devotion.

Poetry, taken as a whole, should present us with an image of man, not of inanimate nature; the drama of real life, not a dream of the universe. And if the starry night is beautiful, it may be nothing to the smile of a little child. One speech of Solomon or Prometheus or Hamlet will teach us incomparably more than ten thousand sunsets. There lies in the heart of the poorest and meanest child a force that cannot be even stated in terms of the deepest philosophy of the physical universe; and 'twill be long ere all the science and all the steam-hammers of the world will beat out a sunset into an act of mercy.

Alongside of this fine temper—man's love of the unfathomable glories of the scene around him—which the amiable prophets of progress and regeneration affect, there lies the opposite extreme—the pessimistic theory—preached and propounded by the poetical worshippers of Schopenhauer and Hartmann, who hold that life is but a tumult and an anguish, universal, meaningless; the embodiment of vain longings, hopeless griefs, endless toil. They have not even as much intelligent insight as that poet waiting for the light, who once sang that the high gods made man, taking

Fire and the falling of tears,
 And a measure of sliding sand
 From under the feet of the years.
 In his heart is a blind desire,
 In his eyes foreknowledge of death :
 He weaves and is clothed with derision,
 He sows and he shall not reap,
 His life is a watch or a vision
 Between a sleep and a sleep.

Faith partially draws the veil aside and man perceives that his origin was not blind chance, his end will not be sleep.

Strong Son of God, Immortal Love,
 Whom we that have not seen Thy face,
 By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
 Believing where we cannot prove—
 Thou wilt not leave us in the dust ;
 Thou madest man, he knows not why :
 He thinks he was not born to die,
 And Thou hast made him ; Thou art just.

Those who lift the blasphemous cry of a helpless, hopeless revolt, have thrown away divine faith, the one key of the world's great enigma ; keeping their human passions quick and strong, they take away the supernatural from creation. What wonder if they are dissatisfied with the dregs that remain behind? For "the sum of man's misery is even this, that he feel himself crushed under the wheels of Juggernaut, and know that Juggernaut is no divinity, but a dead mechanical idol."¹ It is scarcely necessary in the face of this blighting creed to raise the supernatural vision of eternity, of love in reality stronger than death, of the shortness of this cold twilight, and the brightness of a better day, when human nature, losing no human tenderness, no sympathetic thought, no mutual joy of kindred souls that made it beautiful on earth, shall have all these made impassible, immortal, inexhaustible. There is no need to dwell on the hideous skeleton which pessimistic philosophy or poetry may confront us with. No matter how loudly it may be cried in his ears that all of him will die, man will hold in his innermost consciousness to immortality in some form. For from creation's dawn to its end, from the savage to the sophist, the united voice of man is the same forever—"Non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei vitabit libitinam."

If indeed it were not so, then

Might we find, ere yet the morn
 Breaks hither over Indian seas,
 Death's shadow waiting with the keys
 To shroud us from our proper scorn.

¹ Carlyle's *Characteristics*.

Assuredly there is something in this state of existence that baffles all merely human inquiry. There are a thousand discords everywhere, the fragments of countless broken lives; a vast weight of suffering indiscriminately dealt by chance and change, or heaped by men upon each other; an unknown force called life, which science fails to analyze, which can be blotted out in a moment, which cannot be restored, and death which, as far as mortal sight can penetrate, is the end of everything. Doubtless without the supernatural this world would be, "from pole to pole, a very lazarus-house of woe." Here are four lines of the Coryphæus of English faithless poets, which, if mankind believed them and one realized them, might well make them declare that life was not worth its striving and pain, and would render impregnable the position of the pessimist.

We are baffled and caught in the current, and bruised upon edges of shoals:
As weeds or as reeds in the torrent of things are the wind-shaken souls.
Spirit by spirit goes under, a foam-bell's bubble of breath,
That blows and opens in sunder, and blurs not the mirror of death.

Against this dismal view of life the supernatural appeals to us through our reason and through the innate instincts of the heart. Tennyson has given beautiful expression to the persuasiveness of the appeal and the unconquerable yearnings of the soul for immortality. This is the heart's answer to the melancholy lines just quoted.

My own dim life should teach me this,
That life shall live forevermore;
Else earth is darkness at the core
And dust and ashes all that is.
'Twere best at once to sink to peace
Like birds the charming serpent draws,
To drop head foremost in the jaws
Of vacant darkness and to cease.

Were it not so, says the poet of the heart's instinct, man would be a monster, a "dragon's of primeval slime were mellow music matched with him." And so we find the most thoroughgoing materialistic school has found it necessary to provide something for man's spiritual nature, and has made a shadowy divinity out of the abstract being of humanity, and a shadowy immortality of the soul out of a figment that the soul's good deeds do live. George Eliot, "in sad, perplexéd minors," voices this agnostic yearning:

Oh! may I join the choir invisible
Of those immortal dead, who live again
In lives made better by their presence. So
To live is heaven.

Her far-reaching intellect clearly perceived that the most exquisite art cannot make of life deprived of immortality other than a "tale full of sound and fury signifying nothing." And her own great fame, paradoxical as it may seem, is a reward of her loyalty to early teachings that were distinctly religious. Her soul, turned though it was to atheism, kept some memories, a fading reminiscence, a running glimpse of the truth.

It is impossible to calculate the influence which the supernatural has had upon poetry. Love itself, that seems to furnish endless poetical capital, has not, on the whole, been so powerful an incentive to song as religion. The perfections of the Divine Being, and of those mortals who seemed to partake most largely of those perfections, have been the rapturous and constant theme in verse, not only of the chosen people to whom a special revelation was made, but of the most ancient of heathen writers. "Agnostic poetry is a studied attempt on the part of an unbelieving modern sect to reverse the order of things existing from the beginning of the world," and, notwithstanding their boasting, endless and inane pretence of culture and enlightenment, a persistent effort to turn the face of man earthwards, to teach him to growl in morbid lamentation over fancied evils, to revel in an amorphous, black, and barbarous melancholy, to indulge in blasphemy, and to set up in the literary mart a premium on the pessimistic pagan insanity. Under pretence of exalting man, of refining and elevating his intellect, it dishonors and reduces him to the level of the brute creation, stripping him of all moral responsibility, emancipating him from all divine law. "The Christian poet," to quote the words of a recent writer, "can be as subjective and as objective as any agnostic; and it will be long before a singer, thinking scorn of Christianity, will lay bare the secrets of the human heart like Dante, or dwell upon and depict the charms of external nature, which is the art of God, with the power or sweetness of Wordsworth." Under the pressure of the sorrow that no human life escapes, the verse of the unbeliever is the lifting of a puny, but wrathful, arm against the God in whom it believes not, and whom it names only to blaspheme; the poetry of the soul that rests in the supernatural is the upraising of prayerful hands, and the setting heavenwards of a face that has known tears, alas! but knows also and better far the joy of thanksgiving and the peace of an assured hope.

A NATIONAL CATHOLIC LIBRARY.

TO one who walks through the library of the Xavier Union, in New York, there arises a feeling of grateful interest, considering the brief period in which that organization has, by its zeal and energy, been enabled to collect a library of upwards of fifteen thousand volumes. That the selection of books is a creditable one is attested by many critical judges, and Monsignor Capel publicly testified his indebtedness to it for the use of important Catholic works, which he could find nowhere else, even in the great city of New York.

The Carroll Institute, in Washington, our national capital, has a similar library of excellent books, well managed and receiving constant accessions. Catholic libraries exist in other parts of the country, showing that a right spirit has been awakened among our young men especially, to form collections of books, with a view mainly to those by Catholic authors and bearing on the Church in its various relations.

Where many persons thus combine to form libraries for general use, there must necessarily arise the taste which will lead to the formation by individuals of private libraries. Hitherto there have been very few Catholics known in this country as book collectors or bibliophiles. Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan and Rev. J. M. Finotti were collectors in their day, and it is by no means creditable to the Catholic body that both their libraries were allowed to be scattered in the auction-room. The library of Dr. Emmet is extremely rich and valuable; Charles C. Moreau, of New York, was one of the members of the Bradford Club, which gave several important works, and did much to cultivate good taste. The Honorable John Kelly, of New York, has a large and well-selected library, and enjoys his books, as does John T. Doyle, of San Francisco. Extensive as the writer's acquaintance is with publishers and book-dealers, few names occur to him, amid a host of book-buyers known to him, who can be classed as Catholics.

What constitutes the libraries of wealthier Catholic families, it is not easy to tell. Most, we fear, have but a few books, picked up at random, without any settled plan, and with no view to the general instruction of the household. Few, we believe, could show any series of books adapted to give the younger members a higher knowledge and appreciation of their faith and the unapproachable superiority of the Church in every essential point. Yet, if the

home library does not possess them, ignorance must prevail for the associate libraries, such as we have noticed, and our steadily-growing College libraries can benefit but a select few. Where, then, are our young Catholics of leisure to acquire such knowledge as they want when they feel the need of information in regard to any Catholic topic often misunderstood or misrepresented?

It is in vain for any Catholic thus situated to enter our great public libraries, like the Astor, the New York Society, the Public Library, or Atheneum, at Boston, the Philadelphia Library, or any similar one. There are congresses of librarians, and manuals for librarians, but, when we examine them, we can only wonder at the stupendous ignorance of librarians and library managers as to everything Catholic, and their utter lack of comprehending what standard books they ought to have.

A kind of Library Guide, by Perkins, if memory does not play false, was once consulted, just to see what the gentleman's ideas of a Catholic department might be. A more ludicrous exhibition of imbecility certainly never astonished us. There was not a single standard work in any department: what he proposed was a mere random collection of rubbish. Yet, one would think that any librarian, with ordinary common sense, could lay out a plan, and ascertain what was the best book in each branch. To treat of any religion, the instinctive division would be, Dogma, Worship, Government, History. Each would have its subdivisions. Dogma would embrace *Biblical*,—a Catholic Bible and Commentary, such as Migne's "*Cursus Scripturæ Sacræ*," Calmet's "*Dictionary*;" *Patristic*,—a set of the Fathers; *Scholastic*,—the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, and some recent work like "*Perrone*;" *Moral Theology*, represented by St. Alphonsus Liguori. Worship, by the Roman "*Missal*" and the "*Breviary*," in Latin and English, and by some minor English works, like Rock's "*Hierurgia*," Cochin or O'Brien on the Mass, Wiseman on the Ceremonies of Holy Week; Gavantus, The Ceremonial of the Church, the "*Rituale Romanum*;" works on the minor devotions of the Church, and devotions among the people. Government, by one of the great collections of the Councils, supplemented by the "*Collectio Lacensis*," the "*Bullarium Magnum*," Kenrick's "*Primacy of the Apostolic See*," some standard work on the Priesthood. History, a work like "*Natalis Alexander*," the more recent "*Rohrbacher*," or, in English, "*Alzog*," or "*Darras*." To these could, of course, be added, if opportunity afforded, Helyot's "*Religious Orders*," or the special histories of great orders by Wadding, Orlandinus, etc., or histories of the Church in special countries; the "*Bollandists*" for the department of Biography, with "*Alban Butler*" as an English compend, adding separate lives of most eminent saints and person-

ages, as they seemed to be called for. Such a collection need not be very large or costly, but it would enable any one to understand and look up questions arising in any book he might read, which would be obscure without a knowledge of what is really Catholic Dogma, Worship, Government, and History.

Incunabula and illuminated manuscripts are picked up by our public libraries, but, Catholic as these books are, there are rarely Catholic competitors when they appear in the auction room. We know no Catholic collection of illuminated manuscripts, although these are almost exclusively Catholic. Indeed, the finest collection we ever heard of was made by a Baptist clergyman. When the Gutenberg Bible—the first printed book, the first Bible printed by Catholics, who were the first printers—was offered for sale, or when the Missal of Pope John XXIII. was held up in the auction room, no Catholic bids were heard. No wealthy member of our Church was as ready to put his money in such a venture; and yet, even as an investment, either would have paid.

If the homes of many of the faithful are so devoid of works that would inspire the young with such a knowledge of the doctrines, worship, and history of the Church as would make them thankfully proud of the grace of Faith bestowed upon them, and make them fear naught so much as to lose it, there are occasionally Protestant gentlemen whose shelves contain enough Catholic books to make a very fair library for a Catholic family. In the catalogue of Prof. Leander Wetherell, sold last November in Boston, we were struck by the number. Audin's "Life of Henry VIII." and of "Luther;" Balme's "Protestantism" and "Philosophy;" Berington's "Middle Ages;" Brownson's "Review," "Essays," and "American Republic;" Burnet's "Path;" Butler's "Lives of the Saints;" "Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent;" "Catholic Pulpit;" "Catholic Year;" Chateaubriand, "Genius of Christianity" and "The Martyrs;" Thayer's "Controversy;" Darras's "History of the Church;" Dixon's "Introduction to the Holy Scriptures;" Bishop England's Works, and so on, through the whole alphabet.

Our college libraries, the libraries of associations like the Xavier Union and the Carroll Institute, the libraries that our recently formed historical societies are gathering, and such as Rev. A. A. Lambing is forming, all will do good, but it is mainly local. We need something more. When V. Rev. John Carroll entered the lists with Wharton, he felt the want of books; he was forced to appeal in all directions to obtain books to quote authorities or expose falsifications. "Yes," the reader may say, "but that was a hundred years ago, and there is no such need now." We wish there were not, but the very day we write this we are informed that a

learned Professor, with libraries of some reputation at his hand, is obliged from time to time to visit other cities in order to verify references, examine authorities, compare editions.

As the public libraries in the country have not, and can scarcely be expected, for many years to come, to place on their shelves even the meagre number of volumes that ought to be there to enable readers and writers to speak intelligently of Catholic matters, Catholics must devise some plan to supply the want.

The time will come, perhaps, when utter ignorance of Catholic doctrine and Catholic life will be considered disgraceful, but it is not so now; and men well informed in every other branch of knowledge except a knowledge of the religion of their own ancestors, every day with the utmost serenity gravely enunciate statements that a Catholic child could refute. Once, after a meeting of a learned society, the writer heard the Rev. Dr. Osgood express his wonder that, in the large city, such records as we were regarding, the arrow-head inscriptions on tablets from Nineveh, should be a sealed book, intelligible but to a few. Our answer was, that a greater wonder existed in the fact that the cultivated and educated men of one-half the population of the city could not give an intelligent account of the faith, government, or worship of the other half, although their own ancestors professed it for centuries, and they themselves would persist in talking about it as though they were as familiar with it as they were with the alphabet.

This is no exaggeration. The late Dean Stanley, twice to our knowledge, and perhaps oftener, cited as a proof that the power of absolution was not confined to the priesthood, what he stated as an undeniable fact, namely, that at the commencement of the Mass the priest, and the clerk representing the people, each recited the Confiteor, and that the clerk recited the prayer "*Indulgentiam, absolutionem,*" etc., absolving the priest, and the priest did it, absolving the people from sin. Now, apart from the fact that the sacrament of penance is not administered in the Mass at all, it required only to open a missal anywhere, or a Catholic prayer book containing the Ordinary of the Mass, to see that the alleged fact existed only in the imagination of the Dean. The "*Indulgentiam*" is said by the priest alone, and not by the clerk.

Sir Walter Scott makes a lay brother hear a man's confession and absolve him; A. H. Everett, a cultivated writer, tells us that he saw an Ursuline nun say Mass in New Orleans; Street, the poet, opens his poem on Frontenac with Mass at sunset, and Shakespeare editors for three centuries have persisted in printing the utterly absurd expression, "ere evening mass," instead of "ere evening wanes," just as in their Bibles they have for more than a

century printed "strain at a gnat," instead of "strain out a gnat."*

Till our non-Catholic friends come to a realizing sense of their deficiency, we cannot expect them to place in the libraries books to serve as guides to extricate the "children of the mist" from the benighting shades in which they have so long complacently wandered.

The public libraries will not until the day dawns begin to supply the want of reading men; our present Catholic libraries are not broad enough in scope. There are priests, religious writers, and students of all kinds in every part of the country, who find a want of books from time to time, which it will be very slow and often too expensive for any one person to import unseen, merely to consult, perhaps, for an hour, to verify certain statements, or grasp the general treatment of a subject. But the books are not accessible here, and there is no way of consulting them abroad by proxy.

To meet the real want in this country we need a grand central Catholic library, to be gradually enriched with every work of merit in dogmatic, moral, mystic, and ascetic theology, biblical literature, and linguistics, patristics, liturgical and ceremonial, canon law, church history, hagiography, and biography. But if this library is created, how is it to be useful to the Catholics throughout the country? The question certainly presents difficulties, but we think they are not insurmountable.

We may learn something from others. An institution was established a few years ago at Chautauqua with the object of giving instruction in different branches by correspondence. The professors send out lessons to members of the class, receive and answer letters in reply, explaining difficulties that pupils meet, and correct the exercises written by pupils to show their mastery of the lesson. The system is slow, but many whose education has been neglected in some branch have found it an excellent means of progressing under intelligent guidance, and the project seems to have been successful. This corps of men are constantly aiding persons in all parts of the country, and the idea seems likely to be taken up in other directions. A society in this country devoted to the study

* After the recent death of His Eminence Cardinal McCloskey, the writers for the press almost universally showed their ignorance of the government of the Church. The great number of them supposed that his successor as Archbishop would succeed him in the Cardinalate; when really his only successor as Cardinal will be the next one appointed by the Pope, or transferred by the Pope to his titular church, *Sancta Maria supra Minervam*. His successor as Archbishop was one who had been appointed with the express *right of succession*. One was an office of counsellor in the great Senate of Christendom, legislative; the other that of executive in a portion of the church within local limits. The two offices had no more connection than those of mayor of a city and director of a bank, where they happened to be held by the same person.

of history and genealogy pays a salary to a gentleman residing in England who is thoroughly familiar with the great collection of wills in England, and able to refer to county and family histories. Inquiries desired by the members of the society are transmitted to him, and he effects undoubtedly more than the student would by crossing the Atlantic in person.

If our projected University were in operation, as we hope soon to see it, a body of Fellows might be established attached to a great library, with a salary, whose duty it would be to make researches, answer queries, and where necessary send a work to the regular subscribers to the library.

In it, as in our actual circulating libraries, there will be, of course, a large class of books of indispensable reference, more easily attainable, which are not allowed to go out of the library; but it might be a circulating library for a great mass of works. The subscribers to such a scheme, if the plan were put in a practicable shape, would, we think, be large and the maintenance of the library assured. The great difficulty would be to begin, and form such a nucleus of works that it could begin operations within a year or two, for the "Corps of Respondents," though capable men should be chosen and be willing to undertake the labor, must have the requisite works to enable them to reply.

Here is a case which especially calls for endowments from the wealthy, and if the library is annexed to the University, its features of utility might be brought home to many who fail to see the necessity of the University, and who hitherto have made no large contributions, as unlike as can be to the California millionaire who recently set aside twenty millions of dollars for a great university. Many will understand the idea of a great Catholic circulating library whose line of thought does not enable them to grasp the idea of a university; if they help to build up a grand library connected with the University, they will have done much to ensure its success. The project ought not to be made to distract the minds of our people from that great work, but to lead them up to it. Some of our liberal-minded men ought to take up the question of the great University library as their especial part of the work, and leave its shelves loaded with the lore of the Church's nineteen centuries of existence, as the noblest monument to preserve their memory when they depart, and to hand down their name with honor to future generations. No family could wish or have a more enduring monument than a department in such a library, founded and maintained by it, bearing to all time the family name. In thousands of books that department would in time be referred to by name till its reputation was as wide as the Church itself.

If it should be deemed by those whose opinions are undoubtedly

most entitled to respect, for they are invested with authority, that the connection of such a library with the University would be incompatible, some one of our large cities might be taken as the site for such a library, and a society or combination of societies labor in unison to extend it and conquer success by steady, intelligent effort. The libraries of the Xavier Union, of the Provincial Seminary, of Historical Societies, might form a nucleus which would grow by the accession of the collections of clergymen of literary tastes, who would feel a pride in leaving their collections to an institution where their name would be perpetuated. The subscriptions throughout the country to maintain such an institution and endow fellowships would surely come when the whole plan was put forward. The fellowships would be a necessary part to enable students at a distance to obtain intelligent, learned, and scientific aid in the treatment of any question. The late Mr. Lenox had projected such fellowships, in the library which he founded, intending to give funds to afford a salary of \$1500 or more to each student of a particular branch. Proof of real work done was to be given in some prescribed form, but the object was to aid scholars, rather than to diffuse knowledge, as we propose; yet that would certainly have resulted. Applications for information, addressed to the Library, would be referred to these Fellows, according to the subject as to which light was desired. In such a library as we propose, the Fellows would be called upon specially to answer the correspondence of members as an essential part of their work.

In a few years we should have throughout the country a number of trained men, conversant with different branches of Catholic knowledge, and so ready in bibliography and all pertaining to the proper keeping, arrangement, and cataloguing of a library, and so fitted to see and supply its wants, that our smaller local libraries would find competent and excellent librarians, under whom these collections would increase not only in number, but in merit. Such men would be able to direct and guide students and save them from investigation made at a distance, by leading them to the real sources of information, often by solving the difficulty on the spot, or obtaining by correspondence all that was needed, their knowledge of books and libraries enabling them to seek a solution at the proper spot, while the ordinary student could not do so.

These local libraries could be made places where every week readings are given to popularize our literature, give a taste for good books, and so tend to elevate the general taste, increase the number of readers, and in that way enable the publishers to give a host of works that are actually needed, and put a stop to the hawking of claptrap books that are sold to the unwary by the bait of a highly

gilded cover. We must give the people good books, but it is also necessary to show them the merit of books, and enable them to distinguish gold from pinchbeck, and to detect impositions.

The great library cannot exist alone. It must have smaller local libraries to prepare the way, and these to thrive must not only have books, but make them known, appreciated and enjoyed. A pleasant room with a little music, and a half hour's reading of some good author will draw people. This system has been tested in Cleveland and proved successful. It has not yet been tried by Catholics, but it is really the idea of St. Phillip Neri, and can scarcely fail among our people. Those who attend will talk of what they hear, others will come, and of those who cannot some will have their interest aroused sufficiently to get the book and read for themselves. In the deluge of trash showered on the land, and almost forced upon people, persons who wish to read cannot always tell what to take up. Worthless, bad books are read because they are at hand, and easily got; read in ignorance of their real character. A library making good books known can also effectively warn against evil as well as propagate what is sound. This local education by living libraries will be all the more necessary to excite the interest which is absolutely required to maintain heartily and generously a great central Catholic Library.

ST. CYPRIAN AND THE ROMAN SEE.

AMONG the many strange misconceptions current among the members of the Anglican communion, relative to the constitution of the early Church, none is more remarkable than the curiously distorted view given in all their theological works, whether text books of ecclesiastical history, or treatises of a dogmatic or controversial nature, of the character and life-work of St. Cyprian, and of his relations to, and dealings with, the Apostolic See. He is represented as a man entirely ignorant of any peculiar headship existent in the See of Rome, or, if the germ of any such idea is contained in his mind at all, it is merely that he regards the Roman Bishop as *primus inter pares*—first among equals—an accident of position, due, doubtless, to the secular dignity of his episcopal city as the metropolis of the civilized world. We propose to examine four of the principal passages from the Saint's writings which Anglicans are in the habit of citing as arguments against the "Romanism" of St. Cyprian's Catholicity. Let us see whether the words of the holy bishop of Carthage can really be brought up as witnesses against the faith, for which he so earnestly contended—can, indeed, be utilized by those whose aim is to break and destroy that *unity* of the Church in whose defence he expended the supreme efforts of his eloquence.

We are convinced that the only reason why Anglicans should suppose, as they profess to do, that these passages from St. Cyprian are, in the face of so many undoubted testimonies of that saint to the Roman primacy, inimical to the Petrine supremacy, is, because they have not seriously considered them, either as regards the causes of their being written, their surrounding circumstances, or even their grammatical construction. We propose, on the present occasion, to do so as briefly as we can.

In the first place, those who know anything about St. Cyprian, who he was, and what his character was, must see plainly that the use which is being made of his words by the opponents of the Church of Rome, is anything but complimentary to him. For, if St. Cyprian really intended what Anglicans would represent him as meaning, then he was guilty of using words which had no intelligible signification, which were simply nonsense, and of contradicting besides, while in a state of anger and excitement, the principles of a lifetime.

Now, whatever the opinion of Anglicans regarding St. Cyprian

may be, we, as Catholics, venerate him as a saint, and we are not prepared to charge him with folly and self-contradiction, simply for making use of expressions which are capable of an interpretation perfectly consistent with his other utterances and with common sense.

One would think that Anglicans must surely agree with us so far as to allow that, when a good and holy man gives vent to words which are, at least, capable of two interpretations, one of which violates common sense and the evidence of surrounding facts, and, moreover, flatly contradicts the principles enunciated with the greatest emphasis in his other carefully thought-out works; and the other of which is perfectly consistent with sense and facts, and with his own words and sentiments uttered elsewhere, it is a matter of common justice to such a man to adopt the latter, and not in such a case to insult his intelligence and his consistency by utilizing the former, merely in order that we may make a catspaw of him for our own purposes.

The first passage cited by Anglicans in this connection, to which we shall here allude, will be found in *Epistle LXXI*:

"For neither did Peter, whom the Lord chose first and on whom He built His Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him about circumcision, claim to assume anything arrogantly to himself, so as to say that he held the Primacy, and should rather be obeyed by those who were lately and newly come."

It is a singular fact that this particular use of St. Cyprian's words is, by no means, new, nor confined to Anglicans and schismatics of this century. Precisely the same contention was raised by the Donatists, fifteen hundred years ago; and we know of no better reply to the former than that which the great St. Augustine himself addressed to the latter:

"The authority of Cyprian," says he, "does not alarm me, because I am reassured by his humility. We know, indeed, the great merit of the bishop and martyr, Cyprian, but is it anything greater than that of the apostle and martyr, Peter, of whom the said Cyprian speaks as follows, in his epistle to Quintus: 'For neither did Peter, whom the Lord chose first,' etc. [as above]. Here," continues St. Augustine, "is a passage, in which Cyprian records what we read also in Holy Scripture; that the Apostle Peter, *in whom the primacy of the Apostles shines with so excellent a grace*, was corrected by the later Apostle Paul, when he had adopted a custom in the matter of circumcision at variance with the demands of truth. If it was, therefore, possible for Peter in some point to walk not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, —if Peter, I say, could compel the Gentiles to live after the manner of the Jews, contrary to the rule of truth which the Church

afterwards held,—why might not Cyprian, in opposition to the rule of faith which the whole Church afterwards held, compel heretics and schismatics to be baptized afresh? I suppose that there is no slight to Cyprian, in comparing him with Peter, in respect to his crown of martyrdom; *rather I ought to be afraid lest I am showing disrespect towards Peter. For, who can be ignorant that the Primacy of his Apostleship is to be preferred to any episcopate in the world?*"

And, somewhat further on, referring to St. Cyprian's speech at the Council of Carthage, he says :

"Now, let the proud and swelling necks of heretics raise themselves, if they dare, against the holy humility of this address. Ye mad Donatists, whom we desire earnestly to return to the peace and unity of the Holy Church, that ye may receive health therein, what have ye to say, in answer to this? You are wont to bring up against us the letter of Cyprian, his opinion, his council; *why do you claim the authority of Cyprian for your schism, and reject his example when it makes for the unity of the Church?*"¹

It will be seen that the point in the passage we are considering, as St. Augustine understands it, which St. Cyprian wishes to emphasize, is this: That, *although holding the Primacy*, St. Peter was so gentle and meek that, knowing himself to be in the wrong, he did not assert his superior authority in the presence of St. Paul, but humbly allowed himself to be rebuked by him, thus following the example of his Divine Master, "who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery (*ἀρπαγμὸν*, *a thing to be clutched at*) to be equal with God, but debased himself, taking the form of a servant."²

That Anglicans, the keynote of whose religion is self and self-assertion, should be unable to understand the grace of humility, is a matter of course,—we are profoundly convinced that, in the case of the extreme Ritualists, it is the one thing which holds them back from becoming Catholics,—and, consequently, when the blessed St. Cyprian extols the humility of St. Peter, in not asserting his primatial rank, they at once jump to the conclusion that he is denying the Primacy itself! Such a construction, however, is rendered impossible by the previous statement, *quem Dominus primum elegit—whom the Lord chose as Primate (the first of them all)*,—for, since our Lord gave him the office, it was his, whether he asserted it or not.³

The second passage to which we will refer runs thus in the Latin :

"*Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*"

¹ St. Augustine. *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*.

² Phil. ii., 6 and 7.

³ It is scarcely necessary to say, that St. Peter was not first, in the sense of having been called first; that privilege pertained to his brother Andrew.

Considerable diversity of opinion has arisen as to the correct rendering of this passage in English; we venture to submit the following translation as, on the whole, most probably coinciding with what was in the Saint's mind:

"The Episcopate is one, a part of which is held by individuals in trust for the whole."

We do not pretend that the phrase *in trust*, for *in solidum*, by any means conveys the whole signification of that very peculiar expression. Indeed, we believe it to have a far deeper meaning. Our own impression (it may be a fanciful one) is, that the force of *in*, with the accusative, signifies that compression or attraction to a common centre which is the most intimate bond of union. Each individual holds his share in the episcopate, with a view to that intimate union with Rome, the centre of unity, which, by divine institution, is the principle of *oneness* in the Catholic Church. Thus, the episcopate is one, though composed of individuals, each of whom holds his own particular share in trust for the one episcopate—one by reason of its union with its head.

Those who regard this passage as militating against the Roman supremacy, place a variety of interpretations upon it. One, for instance, will endeavor to frame some such argument as this: If the episcopate is one, there cannot be one supreme and universal episcopate in the Roman pontiff, and another, inferior and circumscribed, in the other bishops. Doctor Murray, the late learned and accomplished Professor of Dogmatic and Moral Theology at Maynooth, in his invaluable "Treatise on the Church of Christ," disposes of this precious sophism thus:

"The interpretation of this passage is twofold. 1. The Episcopate is one in all bishops in the same way that human nature is one in all men, to wit, that in all men are those things which constitute the essentials of human nature. Just as, therefore, this unity of nature does not prevent some from excelling others in these or those accidents, such as ability, learning, authority, and so on; so, also, it does not militate against the unity of the episcopate that amongst the bishops there should be one to bear rule over the others. And, as a matter of fact, our adversaries hold that this can actually be the case without interfering with the unity of the episcopate, that some, by merely human right, should preside over others, such as formerly were the Patriarchs, and nowadays the Metropolitans. If there can be an inequality of this kind by merely human arrangement, it is not difficult to perceive how much more may this be by divine institution."¹

It is, therefore, manifest to anyone who calmly considers the

¹ *De Ecclesia Christi*, vol. iii., p. 662.

matter, that an inequality in the *hierarchy* does not break the unity of the episcopate, or, at least, if it does so, then the unity of the episcopate has never existed at all.

Another interpretation, favored by Anglicans, is that given in the Oxford translation of St. Cyprian :

"The Episcopate is one ; it is a whole in which each enjoys full possession."

This brilliant idea is thoroughly Anglican, and as illogical and untenable as are most "brilliant ideas" emanating from that source regarding these subjects. If it has any meaning at all, it signifies that every bishop, simply by virtue of his consecration, possesses universal jurisdiction, and cannot be confined within any limits whatever. If he be so confined, it is a matter of practical convenience. That tremendous potentate, the "Bishop of Gibraltar," has a perfect right to exercise his episcopal functions (and does so), both in Rome and Constantinople, whether the lawful occupants of those sees like it or not. And if his appalling jurisdiction is nominally confined to the whole of the ancient Patriarchates of Rome, Constantinople, and Alexandria, leaving that of Jerusalem (and, we presume, Antioch) to the "Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem," that is, simply because the powers of the above-mentioned awe-inspiring prelate are finite, and not even he can be everywhere, to exercise his universal jurisdiction at once !

For ourselves, we find it impossible to believe that St. Cyprian meant anything so preposterous as this ; for, when we remember that a bishop is not merely an ordaining machine, but an officer set to govern the Church of Christ, we must surely see clearly that a thousand such governors, all endowed with plenary jurisdiction, would render all government impossible. Anglicans, surely, are the last persons to uphold such a theory, for, while they do indeed give the Bishop of Gibraltar three Patriarchates for his modest diocese, they cry out at the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster as a *schismatic* ! If this theory were really true, then Novatian was no anti-Pope, but had just as much right to exercise jurisdiction in Rome as Cornelius himself.

Referring to this passage, the learned Father Ballerini says : "The episcopate is one, in the opinion of Cyprian, just as the Church is one, and therefore a part of the episcopate is held in trust for the whole by each individual bishop (*pars episcopatus in solidum tenetur ab unoquoque episcopo*), inasmuch as his own individual church is ruled by the individual, or his own particular flock, which is a part of the whole Church. But the Supreme Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, although, *as a bishop*, he rules the particular Roman flock, yet, nevertheless, from his Primacy, by

virtue of which he presides over the whole Church, he is, according to the opinion of Cyprian, the centre and origin of the whole unity of the Church."

This interpretation of Ballerini seems, as Doctor Murray observes, to sum up the whole mind of St. Cyprian, as exemplified in all his writings, as well in the "*De Unitate Ecclesiæ*," as in his various treatises and epistles, in all of which he is ever the most energetic upholder of the compact organic unity of the Church. And the centre of this unity he places in Peter ("*one Church founded upon Peter, on the principle and law of unity*," Ep. lxx., *ad Januar.*),¹ and in Peter's see ("*The chief Church, whence the unity of the priesthood takes its rise*," Ep. lv., *ad Cornel.*).² And from Peter through the bishops it flows to the universal Church. "How firmly," says St. Cyprian, "ought we bishops, especially, who preside in the Church, to hold and defend its unity, in order that we may prove the episcopate also to be one and indivisible. Let no one deceive the brotherhood by deceit; let no one corrupt the truth of the faith by perfidious prevarication. *The episcopate is one, a part of which is held by individuals in trust for the whole.* The Church, also, is one which is spread abroad, far and wide, into a multitude by the increase of fruitfulness. Just as there are many rays of the sun, but one light, and many branches of a tree, but one strength based on its tenacious root, and since from one spring flow many streams; although the multiplicity seems diffused in the liberality of an overflowing abundance, yet the unity is still preserved in the source. Separate a ray of the sun from its body of light, its unity does not allow a division of light; break a branch from a tree, when broken it will not be able to bud; cut off the stream from its fountain, and that which is cut off dries up. Thus, also, the Church." In these words he plainly affirms the same kind of unity concerning the episcopate as he affirms concerning the Church—but not of the Church as something abstract or theoretical merely, something to be dreamed about as Anglicans dream singing

We are not divided, (!)
All one body we,

when they know well that the facts of the case are quite the contrary,—but as viewing it in the concrete, as something real and present, as a body of men, he declares it to be one. Other passages from the holy Bishop's writings strengthen this view, such as: "And since the one church has been divided by Christ throughout the world into many members, so the one episcopate has been

¹ "*Una Ecclesia super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundatur.*"

² "*Ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.*"

diffused through a harmonious multitude of many bishops," etc. (Ep. lii., *ad Anton.*) And again: "God is one, and Christ is one, and His Church is one, and the people are one, joined together *into the solid unity of the body (in solidum ?)* by the cement of concord. Unity cannot be divided,¹ nor can a body which is one be separated by a division of its structure."

My readers will probably remember a certain famous passage in the treatise of St. Irenæus "Against Heresies"² relative to the Roman Church. In this passage, it is noteworthy that *necesse est* does not signify a mere moral obligation, but an absolutely unavoidable necessity, by virtue of which every church, *as a condition* of its forming part of the Church Catholic, must agree with the teaching of the Church of Rome. Precisely the same idea is present in the above words of St. Cyprian, except that he is viewing the matter from the standpoint of the Church's indissoluble unity. He declares that the Church is *one*,—one in the metaphysical sense, and he affirms and maintains the simple fact that an entity which is one *cannot be divided and yet remain one*. But inasmuch as this oneness is a divinely appointed note of the Church, it must be perpetually visible in her; therefore, he argues, the Catholic Church cannot be divided.

We think that when we consider the above passages in their entirety we cannot fail to see the utter falsity of the Oxford translation as a true rendering of St. Cyprian's words, while at the same time we are enabled to gather for ourselves his true signification. Doctor Murray paraphrases the passage thus: "The unity of the episcopate or of the bishops is the same as the unity of the Church; individual bishops indeed have their own particular shares, they rule their own flocks, but, nevertheless, in such a way that they should all unite at once in effecting an entire and solid body."

There are various other interpretations of this passage. Bouix³ mentions three. The alternative to the one above given which Doctor Murray seems to prefer, is that set forth by Charlas, according to which St. Cyprian affirms that "a part of the episcopate is held by any bishop, not in common with others, *but alone* (or viewed as a 'corporation sole'), or so as to be the *only* bishop in his own particular diocese who should have the power of ruling, and that he himself should be the one pastor, nor should there be any other pastors," that is, having full jurisdiction, "in the same diocese."

¹ "Unitas scindi non potest."

² Book iii., ciii. "For with this Church (the Roman) on account of its more powerful principality every church must (*necesse est*) agree."

³ De Episcopo. Part i., sect' 2, c. 4, § 2.

Now either of these renderings is perfectly consistent with St. Cyprian's words elsewhere, and with the general tenor of his whole life; the Anglican interpretation is not. We maintain, therefore, that the latter is untenable.

And now we come to the celebrated speech of St. Cyprian at the Council of Carthage. Space will not permit us to enter at length upon a detailed account of the controversy concerning which this Council was convened; the circumstances of the baptismal controversy are familiar, doubtless, to most readers of this REVIEW; suffice it to say that a widespread opinion prevailed among the African bishops that baptism was not valid outside of the Catholic Church, that is to say, that baptism administered by heretics was nugatory and required iteration. This point the Pope strenuously denied, maintaining vigorously, but not, however, *ex cathedrâ*, that every one who was baptized with the proper form, matter and intention, was *ipso facto* baptized into the Catholic Church. This doctrine was afterwards confirmed by the Œcumenical Council of Nicea.

The words under review, which form part of St. Cyprian's address to the bishops assembled in the council, at which he himself presided as primate, run as follows :

"For no one of us constitutes himself a bishop of bishops or by tyrannical terror constrains his colleagues to the necessity of obeying, since every bishop, according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he can judge another. But let us wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, one and alone, has the power of preferring us in the government of His Church, and of judging us in our conduct there."¹

It is maintained by the opponents of the Holy See that these words constitute on the part of St. Cyprian a denial of any universal jurisdiction inherent in the Roman Pontiff, a proof, say they, that the holy bishop was either ignorant of or rejected the idea of Papal supremacy.

It has often occurred to us, when reading the words of the above passage as they lie imbedded in the *Acts* of the council, or in the shape of some smart objection from the pen of a Littledale or a Ewer, that we should like to buttonhole some mild, ingenuous Anglican (such as we knew in days of old), and force him to sit down with this passage of St. Cyprian before him, and say to him: "Now, my good honest man, just *look* at those words, read them carefully, and tell me candidly whether upon mature consideration you think that St. Cyprian *really meant* them to be understood in their *prima*

¹ Acts of the Council of Carthage.

facie literal sense. If you think that he did, then (*sit venia verbo*) you must suppose St. Cyprian to have been a fool, not only contradicting, in a moment of irritation, the principles of a lifetime, but deliberately making observations which he, and all those who heard him, must have known to be undiluted nonsense."

"No bishop can be judged by another any more than he can judge another." If by this St. Cyprian intended what you understand, what on earth did he mean by writing to Pope Stephen: "Wherefore *it behooves you* to write a very copious letter to our fellow bishops appointed in Gaul, *not to suffer* any longer that Marcianus—should insult our assembly. Let letters be directed *by you (a te)* into the province and to the people at Arles, *by which (quibus, i. e. the Pope's letters)* Marcianus being deposed, another may be substituted in his place."¹

This Marcianus was Bishop of the Metropolitan See of Arles, generally supposed to have been situated outside the jurisdiction of the local Roman Patriarchate. He had made open cause with the Novatians, and it was for this reason that the Bishop of Carthage calls upon the Holy See to send apostolic letters deposing him from his bishopric. A peculiar commentary, certainly, upon your understanding of St. Cyprian's speech at the Council!

"But let us wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, one and alone, has the power of preferring us in the government of His Church, and of judging us in our conduct there."

The *literal* signification of these words, you say, is that a bishop is utterly irresponsible, and accountable to no man for whatever actions he may choose to perform; that no one can call him to account but our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and that not in this life.

Now, unless (we would say), our good Anglican, you have surrendered yourself entirely to fanaticism and senseless folly, we cannot believe that even you would maintain that this *could* have been St. Cyprian's real meaning. The whole of the eighty-six bishops who were assembled with him in this synod knew as a matter of daily occurrence that it was not true. They knew that our Lord Jesus Christ had *not*, personally and without any intervening human agency, preferred them in their bishoprics; they knew perfectly well, and so do you, that since our Lord's ascension this could be predicated of no one, with the possible exception of St. Paul, and even of him it is significantly told us that he went up to Jerusalem "to see Peter"; they knew perfectly well that if one of their number fell into heresy, or otherwise misbehaved himself, he was *not* left alone until he was relieved of his bishopric by death,

¹ Ep. lxvi., 2, 3. Ante-Nicene Library.

to take his stand before the tribunal of God; they knew perfectly well that some even of those very heretics whose rebaptization they were now discussing, had once been Catholic Bishops, and been deposed from their offices *by their fellow Bishops* on account of their errors in the faith. It is, therefore, manifest that, unless they thought that St. Cyprian had "lost his head," they could not have understood his words in their literal meaning, and it seems to me incredible that when you come to consider them calmly, you should do so either.

But perhaps our Anglican will reply that we have forgotten the opening words of the quotation: "Nor does any one of us constitute himself a bishop of bishops," etc. No, we do not forget it, but we fail to see what Anglicans can find in it to aid them. Surely it was the simple truth. "Cyprian," remarks Tournely,¹ "does not absolutely deny that any one is Bishop of Bishops, but merely asserts that amongst those Bishops who were sitting at this Third Council of Carthage there was no one who *makes himself* a bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical terror forces his colleagues to the necessity of obedience." This is not a mere *ad captandum* argument, as at first sight might appear. We venture to say that anyone who will take the trouble to think the matter out carefully will come to the conclusion that this *must* have been St. Cyprian's meaning. For, consider the insuperable difficulties we have to encounter if we regard these words as constituting a denial of the existence of any such office as that of bishop of bishops, a title which, we know from Tertullian, was accorded to the Roman Pontiff in the second century.² We have just now referred to the fact that St. Cyprian calls upon the Pope to issue *letters of deposition* against the Bishop of Arles, himself a metropolitan. Was he not in this case urging the Pope to act the part of an *episcopus episcoporum*? St. Cyprian himself, although the Primate of the Church in Africa, would scarcely have dared to *depose* one of his own suffragans without the formal sentence of his synod; but on this occasion he requests the Pope alone, by his mere letters, to remove Marcianus of Arles from his bishopric, and to order another to be appointed in his stead. Was not this calling upon him to enact the part of *episcopus episcoporum*?

Then again, how frequently he refers to the Roman See as being exalted above all other Sees, calling it the "chief church from which the unity of the priesthood has its rise;"³ accusing Novatian of "attempting to assume the *Primacy*," and alluding⁴ also to this very Pope, Cornelius, as having "ascended by all the grades of religion to the topmost summit of the priesthood."⁵

¹ Opera, vol. II., p. sq.

⁴ Ep., l. xv., 8.

² Tertullian, De Pudicitia, ci.

⁵ Ep., li., ad Antonianum.

³ Ep., liv., 14.

We repeat, then, that unless we are prepared to make St. Cyprian contradict and stultify himself, it is impossible to suppose that these words can be intended as a denial of that Petrine Primacy which he elsewhere so strenuously asserts.

But the words under consideration cannot be without some meaning; what must we suppose it to be? Now, we are perfectly willing to admit that it is quite possible that *indirectly* St. Cyprian did intend to make a hit at the Pope. The latter, in the exercise of his authority, had endeavored, by threats of excommunication, to recall the rebaptizing bishops from their errors. St. Cyprian knew that this point as to the rebaptization of heretics had never been formally decided by the Church, and he thought that the Pope was exceeding his authority in threatening to take extreme measures for non-acquiescence in a point not yet defined. He further thought that the Pope's private opinion was wrong. It may tend to render the matter clearer if we imagine a case at the present day. The doctrine of the assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, although it is everywhere believed by all good Catholics, has never been defined, and is not, as our readers of course know, a matter of faith. A man who denied that our Lady was assumed bodily into Heaven would not, *per se*, be regarded as a heretic. We are not saying that he would not be acting with dangerous temerity in thus maintaining his own solitary idea against the common opinion of the faithful; such a man would surely be on the verge of heresy. But let us suppose that he was not alone; that in some distant part of the world the bishops of an entire province were strongly opposed to this doctrine, denying that the tradition was sufficiently strong to warrant a definition. Let us suppose that the Pope (we do not refer to the present revered Pontiff, but any Pope) were a very strong advocate of the doctrine, and commanded (not, of course, *ex cathedrâ*) that it be taught in all the Divinity schools of that province. The bishops demur, and neglect to put the decree into execution. The Pope threatens excommunication for their disobedience, and their Primate calls together the Synod and loudly protests therein against the infringement of their episcopal rights and the abuse of the Pope's supreme authority in forcing them to teach an undefined doctrine, the evidences of which they did not accept as conclusive. And having done so, *they submit under protest*. Let us suppose that this Primate had followed the example of one Archbishop Kenrick, and had written a renowned work on "The Primacy of the Apostolic See;" does any one outside of a lunatic asylum imagine that by his action he was impugning the *lawful* rights of the Chair of Peter? Well, St. Cyprian's position was very similar to this. He was wrong,—mark that,—he and the bishops

with him *were wrong* on their point of doctrine all along, and the Pope was right, but the matter had not been decided, and it is just possible that the Pope had acted with a very little well-intentioned, but undue severity. At any rate, St. Cyprian thought that he had done so, and this is the entire explanation of this whole passage. "It is not we, brethren," he says in a meek but perhaps somewhat querulous voice to his suffragans, "it is not we who make ourselves bishops of bishops, forcing other bishops, under threats of excommunication, to accept undefined doctrines, which they believe to be incapable of definition. In matters undefined, every bishop has a right to his opinion, and ought no more to be interfered with than he has the right to interfere. These matters are not of faith, and, in my opinion, cannot be made so. Let us, then, in very charity, leave it an open question, and when the Lord Jesus Christ comes once again, and every man's work shall be tried, it will be seen who were right and who were wrong."

Such we believe to be the true signification of St. Cyprian's words. It has the advantage of being perfectly consistent with his other utterances and with all that is known of his character; whereas the Anglican interpretation, as we have shown, not only causes him to contradict his reiterated assertions, but puts words and expressions into his mouth which are absolute nonsense. Which of the two is preferable?

If it were a fixed principle that the mere fact of a man resisting the orders of another showed indubitably that he recognized in that other no authority over him, then indeed it might be necessary to adopt the Anglican view of this transaction and accept the consequences of having to charge St. Cyprian, on this occasion, with inconsistency and folly; but everyone knows perfectly well that this is not so; indeed, the Ritualists are the very last persons who ought to lay down such a principle, for it would recoil with deadly force upon themselves. Why was the Rev. S. F. Green in prison for more than a year? Why was the Rev. Pelham Dale pursued even into his new home by the minions of the *Church Association*, with the intention of sequestrating his private income and ruining him a second time? We say nothing of the men who originated this persecution—they are beneath contempt; we say nothing of the judges who, by dint of wresting words from their plain and unmistakable meaning and by the falsification of documents, have sullied that spotless purity of the ermine that was once its boast. But why have these things taken place? Is it not because these gentlemen have refused to obey the orders of their respective bishops in matters regarding which they considered that the bishops were exceeding the authority which their Church had conferred upon them? And yet, we suppose that these gentlemen

would be the first to repudiate the suggestion that they denied that these bishops possessed *lawful* jurisdiction in their own dioceses, and were their canonical superiors. It is therefore manifest that objection to the orders of a superior is not equivalent *per se* to denying his rightful jurisdiction; and inasmuch as St. Cyprian has in many cases, preëminently in that of Marcianus of Arles, affirmed this superiority of jurisdiction in the Roman Pontiff, we have no right to suppose that he was here objecting to anything but what he conceived to be an abuse of power. When one looks calmly and dispassionately at St. Cyprian's words on this occasion, one sees that there is not a syllable which impugns the Papal authority, but simply the Pope's *mode of action* in this particular instance.

There is one other point in this connection to which we should like to call the attention of the reader, for we think it is very significant. There were eighty-seven bishops present at the Council, and *they all spoke*. They were all trying to prove a certain error to be right, and some of them, we are sorry to say, talked great nonsense. But there is this much about it. According to the Anglican idea, the Bishop of Rome, a simple *primus inter pares*, had insolently presumed in violation of decency and courtesy to issue orders to his equals, and to claim an authority which was before unknown in the Church. Now, if this were so, is it not an extraordinary thing that all these eighty-six excited bishops, omitting St. Cyprian,—that they all spoke, many of them most vehemently and unadvisedly, upon the subject of baptism, but not a single one of them made the slightest reference to the Pope or his usurpations? One would have thought they would have been full of it; one would have supposed that some widespread agitation, such as that which astonished the Catholics of England at the restoration of the hierarchy, would have manifested itself, and that clergy and laity would have banded themselves into one indignant phalanx to resist the aggressions of Rome. That is, doubtless, in the opinion of British Protestantism, what they ought to have done. This picture, so dear to the heart of an Exeter Hall speaker, is marred by a single flaw,—they did nothing of the sort! The only bishop present who by his words can be supposed to have had the Pope in his mind at all is St. Cyprian himself; but we have already seen that the words which he uses are perfectly capable of an interpretation which, while it undoubtedly intimates a feeling of irritation at what he supposed to be a stretch of the primatial authority, yet is entirely consistent with his other pro-

¹ Those who desire to read a full account of the proceedings at this Council, with a report of all the speeches, will find it in the second volume of St. Cyprian's works, in the Ante-Nicene Library.

nouncements, affirmative of that power; while, on the other hand, they can only be construed into a denial of the Petrine supremacy by resolving them into a mass of self-contradiction and absolutely unmeaning nonsense.

The fourth and last quotation from St. Cyprian's works to which we would call attention is as follows:

"Certainly the other apostles were as Peter was, in an equal partnership both of honor and power, but a beginning is made from unity that the Church may be set forth as one."¹

It may be argued that, inasmuch as the whole *rationale* of the Primacy consists in the honor and power peculiar to it, if St. Peter did not possess a dignity and power which was wanting to the other apostles, he was not Primate at all. But according to the passage under consideration, they were all equal in honor and power. Here again is that same confusion of ideas to which Anglicans are so prone. The apostles *were* all equal *as regards their apostolate*, just as all bishops are equal as bishops, and all priests as priests. The Constitution of the United States declares that "all men are created equal." This means that *as men* they have the same political rights, but it is not intended to signify that the President, or the State Governors, or the judges and other magistrates, are not superior in their official capacity. And so likewise, that the apostles were not all equal to St. Peter in those peculiar offices and privileges which our Lord in the Gospel conferred on him *alone*, and not on the others, must surely be plain to every student of the Bible. And this passage from St. Cyprian, so far from weakening this distinction, very strongly confirms it, if we take it with the preceding context as it is thus given in Bishop Fell's edition. "Super unum ædificat ecclesiam suam. Et *quavis* Apostolis omnibus parem protestatem tribuat et dicat, 'sicut missit me Pater,' etc.,—*tamen* ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant *utique* et ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis, *sed* exordium ab unitate proficiscitur ut Ecclesia una monstretur." "Upon one He builds His Church. And *although* He attributes an equal power to all the apostles, and says 'as the Father hath sent me', etc., *nevertheless*, in order that He might manifest unity, He made, by His own authority, the origin of that same unity to begin from one. *Assuredly* the other apostles were what Peter was, endowed with a like partnership of honor and power, *but* the beginning proceeds from unity that the Church may be set forth as one."

Now, if the reader will carefully examine this passage, he will

¹ *De Unitate Ecclesia*, 4.

observe that the words printed in *italics* are *antithetical*: *quamvis—tamen, utique—sed*; and this fact must be taken into consideration in order fully to grasp St. Cyprian's meaning. He affirms two things: first, that our Lord made all the Apostles equal in the common offices of the ministry,—absolving from sin, teaching, etc., and also in those privileges which were necessary to their apostolate as founders of this Church,—and that they were altogether equal in exercising those offices; *but*, since our Lord decreed that the Church should be compactly and perpetually *one*, therefore, secondly, *although* they were equal in the before-mentioned offices, *nevertheless* that Christ, for the purpose of effecting and preserving that unity, had accorded to St. Peter another office, peculiarly and individually his own, namely, to be the *root* and *preserver* of this unity. This twofold office is certainly implied in St. Cyprian's words: "Upon that one (Peter) He builds His Church, and to him He assigns His sheep to be fed." The two things are necessarily coördinate. For our Lord to have made him the root and not the preserver of the unity of the Church would have been simply to stultify the office He was conferring upon him, and render it abortive. For the unity of the Church is not a mere ornament, but is, by our Lord's institution, that *visible note* by which she is to be known to all men. To place, then, the *origin* of that unity in an individual as being a necessary means of setting forth that the Church is one, and not to make an individual the perpetual centre of that unity, is something which, to our mind, is inconceivable. It is providing for the ornamental, and leaving the essential and necessary unprovided for. To maintain this is to assert that our Lord imposed the obligation of unity, but withheld from the Church the means of preserving it. For there is no conceivable means by which a multitude of beings, endowed with free will, can be preserved in unity, except by union with a common head.

We have chosen the above four excerpts from St. Cyprian's works for consideration, because it has been urged by Anglicans that they "considerably modify" those passages from his writings upon which Catholics rely. We trust, however, that we have shown clearly enough that, taken in the Anglican sense, they do not "modify," but deprive them of all meaning whatever. The Anglican interpretation can only be upheld at the expense of St. Cyprian's reputation for truthfulness, consistency, and common sense. In order to maintain their own sinful and schismatical position, they are willing to make a catspaw of this glorious martyr and confessor, holding him up to public obloquy as a man weakminded and selfcontradicting, losing his head and his temper at a public meeting, and using words and making statements which

¹ *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, 4.

he himself and every one else knew to be both contrary to facts and foolish in themselves.

"Cease, then," says St. Augustine, "to bring forward against us the authority of Cyprian—but cling with us to the example of Cyprian for the preservation of unity. For this question of baptism has not been, as yet, completely worked out,"—not defined,— "but yet the Church observed the most wholesome custom of correcting what was wrong, not repeating what was already given, even in the case of schismatics and heretics; she healed the wounded part, but did not meddle with what was whole. Cyprian and his colleagues, though they believed," as an *opinion*, "that heretics and schismatics did not possess baptism, yet chose rather to hold communion with them when they had been received into the Church without baptism, than be separated from the unity of the Church, according to the words of Cyprian, 'judging no one, nor depriving any one of the right of communion, if he differ from us.' It is no small proof of a most peaceful soul, that he won the crown of martyrdom in that unity from which he would not separate, even though he differed from it."

It will be seen that, in the above passage, St. Augustine plainly implies (as we, following the holy Doctor, have done) that St. Cyprian, on the occasion we have referred to, was simply maintaining the right possessed by every Catholic theologian to retain his own opinion in matters which have not been defined as of faith.

As a matter of fact, the mind of St. Cyprian was far too keen and logical to allow him to fall into any such quagmire of inconsistency as that in which Anglicans find themselves. If there is one doctrine above all others to whose defence and elucidation he brought all the arts of learning and eloquence, it was that relating to the *indissoluble nature of the visible unity of the Church*. "The divine Scripture," says he, "teaches that the Church cannot be rent in parts or divided, but maintains the unity of an indivisible, individual house."¹ And throughout the whole of that masterpiece of his pen, the treatise "On the Unity of the Church," the same idea of the absolute impossibility of the Church being divided, because, as we have already seen, union with the *visible head* was the *sine qua non* of Church membership, is luminously present. "Does he," he cries, "who does not hold *this* unity of the Church, think that he holds the faith? Does he who strives against and resists the Church, trust that he is in the Church?"² And then, as a rebuke to those who pretend that corruptions and sinfulness among her members can possibly defile the Church herself, or constitute an excuse for violating her unity, he goes on:

"The Spouse of Christ cannot be adulterous; she is uncorrupted

Ep., lxi., 4.

² *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, 4.

and pure. She knows one home; she guards with chaste modesty the sanctity of one couch. She keeps us for God. She appoints the sons whom she has borne for the kingdom. Whoever is separated from the Church is joined to an adulteress, is separated from the promises of the Church. Nor can he who forsakes the Church attain to the rewards of Christ. He is a stranger, he is profane, he is an enemy. He can no longer have God for his Father who has not the Church for his mother. If any one could escape who was outside the ark of Noah, then he also may escape who shall be outside of the Church. The Lord warns, saying: 'He who is not with Me is against Me, and he who gathereth not with Me scattereth.' He who breaks the peace and the concord of Christ, does so in opposition to Christ; he who gathereth elsewhere than in the Church scatters the Church of Christ. The Lord says, 'I and the Father are One;' and again, it is written of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, 'And these three are one.' And does any one believe that the unity which thus comes from the divine strength, and coheres in celestial sacraments, can be divided in the Church, and can be separated by the parting asunder of opposing wills? He who does not hold THIS UNITY does not hold God's law, does not hold the faith of the Father and the Son, and does not hold life and salvation."¹

We have already seen what it is that St. Cyprian means by "this unity," *viz.*, a solid, compact, visible unity; a oneness alike in doctrine and government, brought about by the intimate union of all the bishops with the "throne of Peter, the chief Church, whence priestly unity takes its source."² This was the leading idea in his mind, and the principle upon which he acted in all his controversies with schismatics. Nor is this fact disputed by impartial Protestants like Neander and Mosheim, who, having nothing to gain for their own particular sects by putting, as do Anglicans, a forced construction upon his words, are willing to concede to them their plain signification. The former tells us that St. Cyprian "looked upon the Roman Church as really the 'Cathedra Petri,' and the representative of the outward unity of the Church;" while Mosheim, good man, in the innocence of his invincible ignorance, thinks that "Cyprian and the rest cannot have known the corollaries which follow from their precepts about the Church (!). For no one is so blind as not to see that between a certain unity of the Universal Church terminating in the Roman Pontiff, and such a community as we have described out of Irenæus and Cyprian, there is scarcely so much room as between hall and chamber, or between hand and fingers."³

¹ *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, 4. Ante-Nicene Library translation.

² *Ep.*, liv., 14. Ante-Nicene Library translation.

³ Allnatt. *Cathedra Petri*, p. 62.

But the martyred Bishop of Carthage was by no means so wanting in logical acumen as the worthy historian would imagine him to be ; his actions, as we have seen in the case of Marcianus of Arles (*ex pede Herculem*), show that he was perfectly alive to the consequences of his cherished theory, that he accepted it explicitly, and was fully prepared to submit to the results in his own person, even as he inculcated it in others. How keenly, therefore, do those words of St. Augustine, which we have before quoted, come home to us throughout the whole of this controversy ! With what marvellous fitness does his rebuke to the Donatists apply to those who in our own day would endeavor to shield their miserable schism under the great name of St. Cyprian ; “ You are wont to bring up against us the letter of Cyprian, his opinion, his council ; why do ye claim the authority of Cyprian for your schism, and reject his example, when it makes for the unity of the Church ? ”



A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FATHER ROBERT MOLYNEUX, S. J.

DURING our great Revolutionary struggle the calm old Quaker City on the Delaware was a place of intense excitement and momentous historic interest. It could be truly said that throughout the whole War of Independence “ the eyes of the world were upon it.” There all the talent, wisdom, wealth, and patriotism of the Colonial chiefs and sages could be found in grave and deliberate council, in Carpenter’s Hall, or in the venerated chambers of the old State House. Even those who did not make it a study, or one of the chief objects of their lives, to see great and illustrious men, from time to time, saw on the streets a George Washington or a Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Philosophers, statesmen, and literary characters could be met in every nook and corner of the “ city of marble steps,” engaged in thinking, in planning, or in writing. Warlike bodies, with banners waving, sabres bristling, and drums beating, paraded hourly the streets or squares of the once placid retreat of the peace-loving disciples of George Fox.

Among those who helped to change materially the aspect of Penn’s City were the brave French officers who had chivalrously

sailed away from the fair land of France to strike a blow for America's independence. These lent the beautiful forest of houses on the Delaware a more than ordinary air of polish and refinement. They threw into the meditative and sedate society of Philadelphia a good deal of that gayety and sprightliness so common in some of the cities of their native land. It was impossible even for a Quaker City to remain dull, or in frozen tranquillity, in the gay presence of a Luzerne, a Rochambeau, a De Fleury, a La Touche, a De Melfort.

It must be admitted even by their most ardent admirers that all the French patriots were not as perfect Christians as could be wished; but still, many of them were, even in the camp, as pious and as faithful to their religious duties and devotions as when, years before, they studied in the Jesuit schools of Paris, or knelt with clasped hands by their mothers' sides in the Church of Saint Denis, or in the famed Cathedral of Notre Dame.

The foreign Catholic officers in Philadelphia were inevitably exposed to great temptations and dangers. They had come from a land, such as Poland or France, that had been hallowed by the footprints of saints. They had left behind them a land where all their surroundings inspired them with love and veneration for our holy Religion, though for the time it was bitterly attacked by the infidel and the impious scoffer. The venerated old churches and schools and monasteries and convents and graveyards, at home, spoke to them of the ancient and cherished Faith of their "stout crusading fathers" who "fought and died for God, and not for gold." In Philadelphia they found themselves in the midst of a non-Catholic people who looked down with contempt upon the creed of "papists," though they did not despise the keenness of their ready swords, or the telling force and power of their bullet-arguments. Frequently they had to associate with men like Tom Paine, or worse still, perhaps, with characters like Benjamin Franklin, "Provincial Grand Master of Pennsylvania," who had, it is said, but "a cold approbation for the morals" of the Divine Redeemer of mankind.

But, fortunately, the Catholic officers in Philadelphia were not altogether abandoned to the temptations and seductions that surrounded them. They had a valued friend and counsellor in one who was a great and trusted favorite among them, in a Jesuit who resided at the "Little Church down the Alley," as old St. Joseph's is familiarly called. In all their trials and troubles this good priest was ready to assist them. He showed them the unfading beauty of virtue, the worth of steadfast faith, the consolations of hope grounded on truth. He refuted the vain arguments of error, showed how hollow and fleeting are the joys of this life, and pointed out to

them with a finger of light the true path to peace, to happiness, to glory. He mingled with them on every suitable occasion, and made himself all to all. He visited them in their camps, which were pitched along the shores of the Delaware, said mass for them, preached to the French in the sweet tongue of F  nelon and Bossuet, and gave them the Benediction of the Immaculate Lamb. And many a one of them, before the stirring blast of the war-trumpet sounded in his ear, knelt piously and humbly at the Jesuit's knees and afterwards received the Bread of Life from his hands; and then, with strength and courage from Heaven, marched nobly out "to conquer or to die." These brave soldiers, indeed, conquered. Their arms were victorious. But not a few of them died with the shout of victory on their lips. And then their Jesuit friend and father, while sorrow filled his heart, and tears, perhaps, bedewed his eyes, blessed the fallen heroes' graves, and chanted for their souls the Requiem Mass. The Jesuit Father to whom we refer was none other than that worthy son of St. Ignatius, the Rev. Father Robert Molyneux.

Father Molyneux was a man of much refinement and taste, one who would be an ornament in any society. He was gifted with rare conversational powers, and was one of the most polished and thrilling orators that ever made a Philadelphia church, or hall, ring with fervid and lofty eloquence. Though but few of the sermons of Father Molyneux have been printed, still the voice of tradition proclaims him a man endowed with most of the qualities requisite for the making of a great public speaker. He had a ready command of rich, choice language, a deep insight into human nature, and he felt the dignity and importance of his mission as an apostle of the Word. His voice was full, clear, and pleasant. When preaching to his flock, there was inspiration in his words and whole appearance. On the death of Father Ferdinand Farmer, *vere* Steinmeyer,¹ in August, 1786, a great grief fell upon the Catholics of Philadelphia. The learning and virtue of this holy man were the joy and consolation of his people. His zeal and humility won the admiration even of those who did not belong to the true fold.

¹ "Father Farmer," according to Oliver, "was born in Suabia the 13th of October, 1720. He entered the Jesuit Novitiate at Landsperge at the age of 23. United to the English Province, he was sent to the Maryland Mission, where, Dr. Carroll said, 'he did much good until his death, the 17th of August, 1786.'" "His learning and other commendable qualifications," says Father Molyneux, "soon drew public notice." Hence, without seeking the honor, he was admitted, by the suffrages of a learned acquaintance, a member of the Philosophical Society. To his correspondence with Father Myers, late astronomer to the Elector Palatine, now Duke of Bavaria, that Society is indebted for some curious pieces of that celebrated mathematician on the transit of Venus, dedicated to the Empress of Russia. Father Farmer was also a member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, and was loved and esteemed by Benjamin West, and other celebrities of his time."

When his mortal remains were brought to the "New Chapel"—St. Mary's Church—the citizens of Philadelphia came in vast numbers to prove their love and veneration for him. Father Molyneux preached a touching funeral sermon over his dead brother-priest. After speaking of the learning and "other commendable qualifications" of the departed, he said: "Such has been the man whose remains are before us; while, therefore, we are assembled to pay the last tribute of our regard and affection to his memory, and drop the mournful tear on his funeral tomb, let us not indulge ourselves in unreasonable grief, nor be sorrowful like those who are without hope. He is gone but a little while before us, and points, by edifying example and faithful instructions, to the way we must follow him.

"Let the remembrance of these be renewed on this awful occasion, and so deeply impressed on your hearts and minds as never to be effaced. They will be unto you a surviving guide through the walks of virtue into which he has directed you; they will be as the polar star, by which you may safely steer to the port of eternal bliss, to which we hope he is himself arrived. His voice is no longer to be heard from this chair of truth from which he so frequently and so fervently delivered those lessons to you. His hands are no longer lifted up at that altar to offer sacrifice and supplications in behalf of his cherished flock. The thresholds of your houses are no longer frequented by those graceful steps which he so often made to bring tidings of peace and good greeting of salvation to your ears. He can no longer, with his accustomed and sincere good will for your eternal welfare, invite you to come and partake of those pledges of reconciliation with your God and drink at those fountains of life which flow so plentifully from the loving Heart of Jesus."

Father Molyneux was a large man in every respect—in heart, in frame, in mind, and in soul. He was one of those of whom it could be said—"Nature's nobility sat on his brow." He was such a man as those who follow the path of glory and the smoke and fire of battles would naturally love and admire. This is proved by the fact that he was the idol not only of the French and Polish officers, but also of the chiefs and soldiers of the famous "Irish Brigade" of the Pennsylvania Line.

Among the distinguished Catholic gentlemen who attended St. Joseph's Church during the rectorship of Father Molyneux were Thomas Fitzsimmons, an "extensive merchant," of Philadelphia, who, during the revolution, commanded a volunteer company and was for a long time engaged in active service; General Stephen Moylan, brother of the Bishop of Cork. "Moylan," says Thomas D'Arcy McGee, "after being aide-de-camp to Washington and

commissary-general, was finally transferred to the command of the Dragoons; and in almost every severe action of the war where cavalry could operate, we meet with the fearless 'Moylan's Dragoons.'" Matthew Carey, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and Commodore John Barry, who has been called, by naval writers, "The Father of the American Navy," were also attendants at St. Joseph's, and were, no doubt, on intimate terms with Father Molyneux.

One of the great ends of the Society of Jesus is to educate youth, and to instil into their minds and hearts a love of solid virtue and religion. Father Molyneux, even after the Suppression of his Order, kept this end constantly in view. He was always a strenuous and uncompromising advocate of religious education. He was thoroughly imbued with the impression that children should at all times, and in all places, be trained in virtuous ways, and that from their most tender years they should be taught the sublime lessons of morality and religion. He was the founder, the friend, the protector of one of the first Catholic schools opened in Philadelphia.¹

¹ One hundred years ago, though there were two chapels, St. Joseph's and St. Mary's, there was but one congregation, parish, or mission. As early as 1781 Father Molyneux, remembering the importance of educating the young for heaven, while their minds are being prepared for the duties of life, had his parochial school erected. He knew that the hearts and minds of parents could be more easily gained through the affection and careful training of their children. At what precise date a Catholic School was first opened in Philadelphia, we are not prepared to say, but it was prior to 1781; for in the subscription list of that year mention is made of the "Old" and of building the "New School-house."

This school-house connected with St. Joseph's and St. Mary's, then under the same management, was situated north of St. Joseph's, in the rear of what is now Cochran's wholesale wine house. The masters had to instruct six pupils free and receive pay for all others. The affairs of school, as of church temporalities, were seen to by "Managers" until September, 1788, when St. Mary's was incorporated, and the affairs were in the hands of trustees. On September 1st, 1783, the managers agreed to give the children premiums to the value of twenty shillings, four times a year, for improvement in studies.

If we consider the difficulties that encumbered our Fathers, the location of the church and school house, we must acknowledge that the work of Father Molyneux to build a Catholic school in 1781, ere the warm feelings caused by the Revolution had ceased, in the hot-bed of prejudice, within a short walk of Penn Park, and within a stone's throw of the Quaker Almshouse, was an arduous task.

As the many flourishing and stately churches, which are now the pride of Philadelphia, have sprung from St. Joseph's humble beginnings, so the magnificent and costly Seminary of St. Charles, at Overbrook, took its rise from the ruins of the "Old school-house." The first attempt at an ecclesiastical seminary for the diocese was in the residence of Bishop Conwell, the old St. Joseph's residence. Among the students were Michael Keenan* of Lancaster, Penn., and John Hughes, afterwards Archbishop of New York.†

When Bishop Kenrick was appointed administrator of the diocese, he also had a

* Died a few years ago, having been parish priest in Lancaster over fifty years.

† He finished his education in Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Mt.

He may, indeed, be considered the Father of Religious Education in this city.

As a missionary and pastor, the labors of Father Molyneux were arduous, incessant, and fruitful. Many a poor wandering soul he led back into the ways of penance, many a noble Christian soul he faithfully guided up the steep and rugged paths of perfection. There was a time when he and another brother Jesuit were the only priests in Philadelphia. On these two devolved the sacred duty of attending not only to the wants of the Catholics around them, but also to the needs of those of the Household of Faith who were scattered on the mountains of Pennsylvania, in the wooded fields of New Jersey, and even on the banks of the Hudson. His eloquent pen and tongue were the joy of his people and the terror of the enemies of the Church which he loved and served with all the devotion of his heart.

Father Molyneux was, for a time, Professor of English to some of the more distinguished Frenchmen who resided in Philadelphia during the days of the Continental Congress. Among those whom he initiated into the mysteries and beauties of our language was the Chevalier de la Luzerne.

In all the grand Catholic religious services held in Philadelphia during the War of Independence, Father Molyneux was sure to be, if not the central figure, at least a prominent one. For some years later, too, he was always conspicuous in Catholic ceremonies and meetings. "On the 25th of August, 1781, the birthday of the King of France, Louis XVI., was celebrated at St. Joseph's, with much pomp. The French Minister was present at Mass, his musicians accompanying the organ, and some of the gentlemen of his household singing. L'Abbé Bandal was celebrant." On this important occasion, the orator of the day was Father Molyneux.

Father Molyneux was a ripe scholar. In one of the old Jesuit colleges, on the European Continent, he laid the solid foundations of a deep and varied store of learning. And so great was his knowledge that he himself was appointed Professor of Philosophy at Bruges, in Belgium. While Pastor of St. Joseph's, Philadelphia, he helped, materially, his illustrious pupil, Archbishop Carroll, in his various controversies—by references to books, and even by his own notes and points.

By birth, as well as by education, Father Molyneux was a thor-

kind of seminary in his residence—first in Fifth street below Powell,—afterwards on the east side of Fifth street below Prune, close to St. Mary's graveyard.

But the first ecclesiastical seminary, of any pretensions as a seminary, was located in an old building in the rear of the pastoral residence of St. Mary's Church, whence it was transferred to the northeast corner of Eighteenth and Race streets, and later to Overbrook.

ough gentleman. He was descended from a high and distinguished line of ancestors. Many of those who were of near kin to him had become famous for their devotion to the oppressed cause of the Old Religion. He had a brother who, like himself, had followed the standard of Ignatius Loyola. Born at Formby, County Lancaster, England, on the 24th of July, 1738, he witnessed, in his youth, the direful workings of the cruel Penal Code. But the animosity of the enemies of the grand old Roman Creed only made it dearer to him, only made him prize it the more. The pictures hanging on the walls of his ancestral chambers inspired him with generous and lofty sentiments, and kindled in his youthful heart a deep and lasting reverence for the ancient Faith of his venerable forefathers. Being sent, while still a mere boy, to one of the Catholic continental colleges, he early mingled in the society of confessors of the Faith from Ireland and his own unhappy country. From these he caught that spark of apostolic fire that ever after burned in his heart. Amid the sufferings, the unheard-of sufferings, of the Catholic Church in England, he witnessed the continual labor and the heroic sacrifices of the Brothers of St. Francis Xavier, and he learned to love and admire them. While on the Continent, he had them as teachers, as advisers, as spiritual fathers, and he grew to love them, and he longed to imitate them. In his nineteenth year, full of life, and talent, and promise, he, wisely and gladly, and with a generous spirit, turned away from the pleasures and seductions of a false and deceitful world, and entered a humble Jesuit Novitiate. We may easily fancy the holy life he led while a novice. He fully appreciated the value and importance of an interior life, "from which," as St. Ignatius says, "force must flow to the exterior." We well know that no man but a spiritual man could become a true apostle, or render any great service in God's Church. In his sermon on the death of Father Farmer we find the following passage, which may well be applied to himself: "There is yet," he says, after speaking of the public life of the deceased, "a hidden treasure laid up in heaven, unseen and unknown to the world, but highly precious before God, who knows the inward man, and searches our reins and hearts. Those scenes of silent contemplation on heavenly truths and secret conversations with God Himself, to whom he daily poured forth his pious soul in ecstasies of love and raptures of admiration of the Divine perfections! Could the humble cell of his late habitation but relate what passed in these moments, it would go far beyond what you have yet heard or seen! These are those inward beauties of the righteous soul: those springs which impart life and action to all that outwardly appears so zealous and virtuous, and imprints the stamp of solid worth and merit. These will be found to shine as

no inferior ornaments in the celestial crown. View him, in fine, through private or public life, you will not find him swerving from that golden device of the institute of his order—the greater glory of God.”

Since the “Pilgrims,” under the favor of Lord Baltimore, sailed in the *Dove* and *Ark* up the waters of the Potomac, in 1634, until the suppression of the Society of Jesus, in 1773, the Maryland Mission was confided to the care of the English Jesuit Province. The Fathers came thence, in almost unbroken succession, to labor ardently and heroically for the salvation of the settlers, Indians and slaves on the shores of the Chesapeake, and on the banks of the Potomac and Patuxent rivers. And their labors were blessed, and crowned with success; for, even in our day, the descendants of the Maryland Pilgrims, not only in the southern part of “*Terra Mariæ*,” but also in many other portions of the United States, still cling with love and veneration to that Church, of which Fathers White, Altham, Fisher and Copley were apostles. Soon after his elevation to the priesthood, Father Molyneux was sent on the Maryland Mission.

After leaving Philadelphia, Father Molyneux was sent to take charge of the mission of “Bohemia Manor.” Before him the Jesuit missionaries had labored in Cecil County, Maryland, in which the Manor is situated, for almost a whole century. We know not how it came to pass that the Jesuit residence became synonymous with the *Bohemia Manor*, for, in reality, they were distinct and separate homes. Perhaps, it is because the Jesuit property, in the course of time, included some of the Manor estate. The original Bohemia Manor, as we see from an old document before us, was taken possession of by Augustine Herman, in “*October, Anno Domini One Thousand Six Hundred Sixty and Three*.” It included about four thousand acres of good land, and two thousand acres of “Swamps, Barrens and Pocosons.” In 1704, Father Thomas Mansell built a church and residence not far from the Great Bohemia Manor. After him came, as successors, Fathers Peter Atwood, Thomas Poulton, Joseph Greaton, John Lewis, Joseph Mosley, Matthias Manners, John Bolton, and many other early Jesuit missionaries. All these priests left behind them marks of apostolic zeal.

Father Molyneux was faithful to the bright and glorious example set by his predecessors. Everywhere in Cecil County he helped to extend the Kingdom of Christ, to perfect the work of those holy men who had gone before him. He did not confine his apostolic excursions to the adjacent villages, but wandered frequently, in his zeal, through many parts of Delaware, to strengthen and console the few Catholic families who lived in that State.

In an old document, dated October 3d, 1793, we find the names of Rev. Mr. Walton, Rev. Mr. Molyneux, Rev. Mr. Ashton. Besides these names we find, *Declaration of Property*. The Declaration of Father Molyneux is as follows: "I, Robert Molyneux, of the County of Montgomery, and State of Maryland, do, by virtue of these presents, make known, publish, and declare, in conformity and agreeably to an Act of Assembly of the State of Maryland, entitled, 'An Act for securing certain Estates and property for the support and uses of the Ministers of the Roman Catholic religion,' that the Real property hereafter specified, viz.: A Tract of Land, known by the name of St. Joseph's, lying in Talbot County, containing two hundred and seven acres and a half, more or less, hath been and now is held by me under a confidential or implied trust for the use, benefit, and maintenance of the ministers of the Roman Catholic Church now exercising their Ministerial Functions within the United States of America, agreeably to the Rules and discipline of their Church, and who were formerly members of the Religious Society heretofore known by the name of the Society of Jesus. In testimony whereof, I hereunto set my hand and seal, this third day of October, Anno Domini one thousand seven hundred and ninety-three. Robert Molyneux [seal.]"

After leaving Bohemia, Father Molyneux went to Georgetown; but, further on, we will refer to his stay at that college. In 1797 he arrived in Newtown Manor, St. Mary's County, Maryland. This ancient Jesuit residence, situated beautifully on a neck of rich land between St. Clement's and Britton's Bay, and bounded on the south by the Potomac, is one of the oldest and most important of the Jesuit houses in Maryland. Its history is one of peculiar interest. The manor was taken possession of as early as 1639, by William Britton, a brave soldier of St. Inigoes' Fort, and one highly distinguished in the annals of southern Maryland. We know not at what precise period the first chapel was built at Newtown, but we are certain that one was built there in 1661. In 1668, the Newtown estate was purchased by Father Henry Warren, *alias* Pelham, for forty thousand pounds of tobacco. The present church¹ at Newtown, St. Francis Xavier's, was built by Father James Ashby, *alias* Middlehurst, in 1767. We have seen Father Molyneux among the gay French officers of Philadelphia; we may now see him in other company. He who thrilled the *élite* of that city may now be heard pouring forth his tides of sacred eloquence within the narrow walls of a little country chapel. In place of officers and men of distinguished civic rank, in place of literary men, he now addresses the humble tillers of the soil and a few fishermen.

¹ The bell of this church was cast in London, in 1691. It may be of interest to remark that the bell at St. Inigoes is older still, having been cast in 1682.

Though in St. Mary's county there could have been found, at the period of which we write, many Catholic gentlemen and ladies of education and refinement, still those with whom the priest had most to do, on account of their wants, sorrows, and trials, were the poor and the slaves. In the hovels of the poor, and in the quarters of the slaves, then, Father Molyneux could be found for the greater part of eight long years. It was a most edifying and touching sight to see Molyneux, the scion of an illustrious family, a professor of Bruges, a noted orator in a polished city, a scholar of varied attainments, visiting daily the poor sick slaves who were confined to their lowly beds in the dark rooms of their old log-cabins. Oh, the zeal of apostolic men! Oh, the charity of the Religion of Christ!

The Society of Jesus, suppressed in 1773, was reëstablished in this country in 1805. Some of the ex-members of that Order immediately renewed their vows of religion with a holy joy. These were soon joined by a devoted band of Jesuits from White Russia. The virtue of Father Molyneux was well known to all Jesuits, and his learning and prudence had long been appreciated by them. It was, therefore, no surprise to any of them when they heard that he had been appointed Superior of all his brethren in the Mission of Maryland.

Father Molyneux was no ordinary man. He stands out before us as a great and good man. He was an ornament in the Church and an honor to the Order to which he belonged. Through the dim records of our history we see in him a character to be loved and revered, one of the pure members of the royal Christian Priesthood. As a pastor, or missionary, he endeared himself to his flock; as Superior of a religious Order, he won the confidence and affection of his subjects by his sweetness and his kind and affable manner.¹ On account of his learning, zeal for souls, and his solid virtue, he may well be considered one of the chief glories of the Catholic clergy in this country. "His," wrote a Philadelphia clergyman a few years ago, "was an eventful life; his it was to instruct the first Archbishop of Baltimore in Philosophy; his it was to direct St. Joseph's congregation when it no longer made a man a pariah to be a Catholic, but even a Quaker thought Catholic influence of sufficient importance to be courted—in the early days of the Revolutionary struggle. Father Molyneux was pastor, with Father Farmer as assistant, during the whole Revolutionary War, and also in 1781, when a solemn service of Thanksgiving was offered

¹ Father Anthony Kohlmann wrote to the distinguished Father William Strickland, in 1807: "Nôtre digne Père Superieur, le R. P. Molyneux, demeure dans la maison du Novitiat, et possède la confiance et l'affection de tous par la bonté de son cœur et la gaieté de son humeur, qu'il conserve toujours dans son heureuse vieillesse."

to Almighty God for the assistance rendered by the French to the struggling Colonies."

Father Molyneux was not the first Jesuit who labored for the Faith in the midst of the Philadelphia Friends. As early as 1686 Mass was occasionally said in some private house on the banks of the Delaware. This was only four years after William Penn had founded his city. The name assumed by the zealous missionary who, in 1686, read Mass in the new town "bounded by the two rivers, Delaware and Schuylkill, and on the north and south by Vine and Cedar streets, was *John Smith*. This priest, who labored for some time both on the Eastern and Western Shores of Maryland, is identical with Father Henry Harrison,¹ who was, for some time, in Fort William, New York, during the governorship of the distinguished Catholic, Colonel Thomas Dongan. In the "Documentary History of New York," we have the following reference to this priest: "There was a cry that all images erected by Colonel Thomas Dongan on the fort should be broken down and taken away; but when we were working in the fort with others, it was commanded, after the departure of Sir Edmond Andros, by said Nicholson, to help the priest John Smith to remove, for which we were very glad, but was soon done, because said removal was not far off, but in a little room in the fort, and ordered to make all things for said priest according to his will and perfectly, and to erect all things as he ordered from that time." We learn from a letter of Jacob Leisler, that during the Protestant revolution of 1689, some of the distinguished Catholics of southern Maryland were at Philadelphia. Leisler writes from the "Fort" of New York: "It is 3 weeks agoe that I heard of some of your papist grandees to be at Philadelphia." Among these Maryland "papist grandees" were several of the old friends of Father Harrison. We may reasonably suppose that he went to Philadelphia to see them, and attend to their spiritual needs. There can scarcely be a doubt concerning the visits of the Jesuit missionaries, Harvey² and Gage,

¹ In 1686, there were three Jesuits in New York, Fathers Charles Gage, Thomas Harvey, and Henry Harrison. About 1687, Father Gage returned to England; for we find him at Norwich in 1688, the year of the Orange Revolution. In 1689, there remained only two Jesuits at New York, Harvey and Harrison. As Harvey was known by the *alias*, Thomas Barton, his companion, Harrison, must certainly be the priest *John Smith* alluded to at this very time in the "Documentary History of New York."

² In the "History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York," also in the "Catholic Church in the United States" and in the "History of Philadelphia," it is stated that Father Harvey died in 1719. With all due regard for the authority of the learned authors of these works, we would venture to say here that we believe this to be a mistake. In the Catalogues of the Society, kept at the Gesu, in Rome, Father Harvey is said to have died in 1696. This is also asserted in the "English Records," edited by Br. Henry Foley, S. J.

to Philadelphia between the years 1686 and 1688. The few Catholics in New York were not able to satisfy the zeal of these missionaries, and so, from time to time, they made excursions to Amboy, where, according to Leisler, there was "a company of papists and popishly affected people;" to Burlington, where there were some very wealthy Catholics; and, we may suppose, also to Philadelphia. From catalogues before us, we see that the New York Jesuits frequently travelled on foot even as far as Newtown and St. Inigoes, in southern Maryland. In later times, when New York had no resident priest, it was occasionally visited from Philadelphia by Father Farmer. Fathers Greaton, Harding, Neale, and Lewis had also been in Philadelphia before the arrival of Molyneux in that city. But if Father Molyneux was not the first priest there who sowed the good seed for one of the most flourishing and noble churches on this continent, he helped, to a great extent, by his science and virtue to lay deep and wide and strong its glorious foundations.

Besides his other virtues, as pastor and superior, Father Molyneux showed a constant and unrelenting hatred of sin, an utter contempt for the things of this world, a great desire of religious perfection. Wealth, and rank, and pleasure, he cheerfully and willingly forsook for the love of his Divine Master. He followed closely in the glorious footprints of the companions of Ignatius of Loyola. From his own pen we have the picture of his ideal of a perfect pastor. We again copy from his sermon on Father Farmer: "The greater Glory of God appears to have been the origin, the aim, and the end to which, through every step of life, his mind and heart have been uniformly directed. Like the faithful husbandman, he has cultivated his Master's vineyard, and with zeal and diligence; he has dug it and pruned it in the scorching heat and pinching cold; he has watered it with his tears, and enriched it with the sweat of his brow; he has used all possible endeavors to clear it of the brambles and thorns which he discovered to encumber it; in fine, he has fenced it round with a double hedge of edifying examples and of sound, faithful precepts."

Another fact in the life of Father Molyneux must not be passed over in silence. He was the second Rector of Georgetown, the oldest Catholic College in the United States. Among the distinguished Rectors of this Institution we may name Bishops Louis G. Dubourg, Leonard Neale, and Benedict Fenwick; also Fathers Francis Neale, John A. Grassi, Anthony Kohlman, Stephen Dubuisson, William McSherry, and James Ryder. Fathers Ryder¹

¹ Father James Ryder is still well remembered in Philadelphia as an eloquent pulpit-orator.

and Dubuisson were for some time stationed in Philadelphia, and were loved and esteemed for their virtue, zeal, and learning. While the latter was Pastor of St. Joseph's Church, in 1833, he attended to the Catholics of Trenton; that city is now honored with a Bishop. Father Molyneux was twice chosen Rector of Georgetown College; first, in July, 1793, and afterwards in October, 1806. During his Rectorship he strove effectually to elevate the course of studies and to promote among its students a love of virtue and science. Those who are familiar with the early history of the famous old college "situated on the northern bank of the Potomac, commanding a full view of Georgetown, Washington, and a great part of the District of Columbia," could, no doubt, give many interesting details relative to the great statesmen, foreign ambassadors and nobles and distinguished warriors of the Revolution who visited it during the Rectorship of Father Molyneux.

Father Molyneux during his lifetime made many distinguished friends in this country, in England, and on the Old Continent. But those who seemed to love and admire him most were those who, like himself, had consecrated their labors and their lives to the service of our Holy Church. The English Fathers whom he had known as missionaries in his native land, or as students in Belgium, always preserved for him a warm place in their hearts. In many of their letters we find them anxiously inquiring about his health or his labors. He was loved and esteemed to a greater extent still by all his brethren who devotedly labored in the missions in this country, whether their lot was cast on the borders of the Chesapeake, or in some of the more populous towns elsewhere. But the one who ever esteemed him most, the one who ever loved him most dearly, was the first Archbishop of Baltimore. There is something beautiful in the pure friendship that always existed through the varying events of life between him and the illustrious Prelate. These two great souls fully understood each other. The Archbishop, who had been trained in Jesuit schools, who had himself been a son of St. Ignatius up to the suppression of his Order, could fully appreciate the spirit that filled the lofty soul of his old professor. He could see in him a man who aimed continually to accomplish, in little as in great things, something for the glory of God and the advancement of His Earthly Kingdom. So highly did the great Archbishop esteem Father Molyneux that, over and over again, he tried to prevail upon him to become his Coadjutor Bishop. But from the dignity and the responsibility of the purple, the mitre, and the crosier, Father Molyneux always humbly fled.

After a life spent in the service of his neighbor, after a life devoted to the advancement of religion in these United States, after

a life of toils for Christ's love, Father Molyneux sank from his labors and his sufferings on the 19th of December, 1808, and went, we hope, to take possession of his crown, and throne, and sceptre, among God's angels and saints. Archbishop Carroll wrote, on the 21st of February, 1809, to Father Charles Plowden, Stonyhurst, near Clitheroe, announcing, in touching terms, the sad news of the demise of Father Molyneux. "About the beginning of December," writes the Archbishop, "I advised you of the apprehension I was then under, of daily hearing of the death of our old, good, and much-respected friend, Mr. Robert Molyneux, which event took place at Georgetown on the 9th of that month, after his being prepared by a life of candor and innocence, and by all those helps which are mercifully ordained for the comfort and advantage of departing Christians. Not only your charity, but your friendship for him, with whom you passed so many and cheerful and happy days of your life, will induce you to recommend very often his soul to the Father of mercies. He was my oldest friend, after my relation and companion to St. Omer's in my childhood, Mr. Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, remaining amongst us, as he often and feelingly reminded me the last time I saw him, in the month of September, with very slight hopes of meeting him more in this world."

In his "will," Father Molyneux says: "First, I give and bequeath my soul to Almighty God, in whose mercies I place my hopes, and my body to earth, to be decently interred." It is said, that his body, which was, indeed, "decently interred" amid the prayers of his religious brethren, and the tears and sobs of his many and dear friends among the laity, was the first laid in "the lowly valley of the dead at Georgetown."

A FEW WORDS MORE ON THE NEW BIBLE.

The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the Original Tongues; being the Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised. Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Oxford: at the University Press, 1885. Four volumes, 8vo.

MANY scholars some thirty years ago had no difficulty in predicting that a revision of King James' Bible would never take place, because such revision was morally impossible. It was taken for granted that none but the best scholars would undertake the work, and they must be supposed incapable of offering to put their hands to a no less futile than laborious task. The reasons alleged why such undertaking would be premature, rash, useless, and therefore not to be counted within the range of possibility, were manifold in detail; though they might be reduced to two general heads, viz., the acknowledged excellence of King James' translation, and the incompetency of actual scholarship to improve it.

Dr. Trench¹ (Dean of Westminster, and afterwards Archbishop of Dublin) decided that revision could not be thought of, because neither the Greek nor the English, necessary for such a work, could be found in the scholars of our day. Yet the time might come when a revision, though not needed, might be tolerated on purely philological grounds. Even thus, the work could only be entrusted to Anglican scholars and divines commendable for "their piety, their learning, and their prudence." Of course, no dignitary of the English Church could be expected to allow the Scriptural work of her royal Pontiff to be examined and reformed by those outside of her pale. And such claim, for all its apparent exclusiveness, cannot be accused of harshness or injustice. The Bible of 1611 had for its author the Supreme Ruler, and, as Anglicans profess to believe, the divinely appointed Head of their Church. There can be no doubt that he had the translation made as a doctrinal and disciplinary measure for the benefit of his spiritual subjects, and chiefly that it should serve as a prop for kingly and Episcopal power against the seditious spirit of Geneva and the Puritan divines. It may be true enough that the royal simpleton

¹ On the Authorized Version of the New Testament in connection with some recent Proposals for its Revision, by Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D., etc. New York: Redfield, 1858.

was egregiously befooled by his faithless translators. They tickled his ears by the most fulsome flattery, and thus blinded his eyes to their real purpose, which was to make of the translation a crafty compromise, a neutral book, in which revelation might lend its support alike to the pretensions of the hierarchical faction and to the leveling tendencies of their Presbyterian foes. But whether good or bad, a failure or a success, the book remains the property of its legitimate owner, the Anglican Church, and she alone has the right to subject it to official examination and modify it, if she will, by authoritative revision. Dr. Trench, however, showed great liberality in allowing that learned men of other denominations (with the exception of "the so-called Baptists") might be allowed to offer "suggestions" which the Anglican revisers would accept or reject as they judged best.

Mr. George P. Marsh,¹ writing about the same time, gives other reasons why no attempt at revision should be made just now. In the first place, English philology, or the critical study of English, is only in its infancy. Hence any revision attempted under present circumstances must be premature, and will have to be flung aside as worthless, should the day come when revision may be undertaken with some show of reason and prospect of success. Besides, he thinks, the knowledge of biblical Greek and Hebrew of which scholars will be in possession by the year 1899, will exceed that of the present day fully as much as the latter surpasses what was current in the beginning of the century. This argument, if fairly pushed, might be as conclusive for adjourning the revision to the year 1950 or 2000 as for beginning it in 1900. Mr. Marsh has another reason for putting off to a distant day all attempts to tamper with the received version. And this reason might have been profitably weighed by the revisers of 1881-84, had their object been to reproduce faithfully God's Word, instead of weakening it by insidious so-called scholarship. Mr. Marsh sees danger in the new systems of German criticism and theology, which have raised questions not of verbal interpretation merely, but of doctrine also, the discussion of which is no longer confined to Germany, but has spread to every part of the English-speaking world. And he deems it "highly improbable that a sufficient number of biblical scholars could be found even within the limits of any one Protestant denomination in either country (England or America) whose theological views so far harmonize that they would agree in new forms of expression upon points now under discussion." This, whether so intended or not, is far from a flattering compliment to Protestant unity and orthodoxy, when we reflect that such discus-

¹ Lectures on the English Language, by George P. Marsh. Third edition. New York: Charles Scribner, 1860. Lecture xxviii. The English Bible, p. 617-643.

sion covers points of vital interest to Revelation and the Christian religion.

Another critic, treating of the subject in the same year, thus summarily disposes of the Revision project. "The very completeness and sufficiency of the English version have, perhaps, prevented that painstaking and persevering study of the original languages of inspiration which marked the religious mind of the seventeenth century. It is certain that English-speaking Christendom cannot now present such a combination of profound scholarship and Christian charity on cardinal doctrines, as that which assisted the great work of the Bible revision in the days of King James"¹ If this were true, the Anglican version would be a marvel of perfection, and revision could not improve but only deface its fair lineaments. But we are quite sure that the writer did not intend his language to be taken *au pied de la lettre*; and that the esoteric sense of his words implies only rebuke of that idolatrous veneration in which the Bible of 1611 is held by too many of its admirers, and which, by resenting any attempt to investigate its boasted fidelity to the original, tends to raise up a perpetual barrier against all efforts of scholarship to improve or correct it by revision.

In spite of all the reasonings and forebodings of Trench, Marsh, and many others at home and abroad, the Revision has been undertaken and is now an accomplished fact; the New Testament having been given to the public in May, 1881, and the Old Testament four years after, in 1885. American divines of every religious hue were invited, not only to offer suggestions, but to examine and criticise the English work of revision, and, where they dissented on weighty matters, to have their opinions recorded in a special Appendix. Moreover, amongst the revisers sat not only Presbyterians, Methodists, and Lutherans, but even Quakers, Unitarians, and those dreadful Baptists, against whom Trench had raised his warning voice. The only condition imposed on the dissenting American revisers was, that for ten years they should abstain from issuing any edition of the Bible as their judgment would have it amended, and meanwhile "give the whole weight of their influence in favor of

¹ Russell's Magazine (October, 1858). Charleston: Walker, Evans & Co., vol. iv., 87. This magazine, though making no pretensions like its Northern contemporaries and their successors, numbered among its contributors such writers as William Gilmore Simms, Paul H. Hayne, and other able exponents of Southern literature. The article whence the extract given in the text is taken, is anonymous; but we think we could place our finger on the gifted writer. It was his delight in conversation, especially when amongst his hearers there were many of the "unco godlie," to take up some one of the idols of vulgar Protestantism (King James' Bible, for instance), and actually demolish it by extravagant praise, his edified hearers applauding him meanwhile as a fellow-worshipper. It was only the *élite* of his audience who could discern and enjoy the quiet irony and latent sarcasm with which he did his work. In the extract quoted, one reading between the lines may find traces of the same humor.

the English issues."¹ That they should not interfere with the privileges and profits of English publishers, was merely submission to a bargain, in which English shrewdness had the advantage. But to force upon them the positive promise that they would use their influence in aiding the circulation and perusal of a Bible which they believed to be incorrectly translated and incompletely revised, was something worse. It was cruel exaction on one side, and unworthy acquiescence on the other.

The American revisers were not ignorant of the importance and conscientious obligations of their assumed task, and knew well how to magnify their office when occasion called for it. One of themselves says: "To supplant a book which has been venerated by high and low for nearly three centuries, and has entered into the heart and life of the people as no other volume has ever done, is not a thing to be effected on short notice or by a sudden burst of enthusiasm. So grave a procedure requires the utmost caution that no source of information be neglected, that no error fail to be guarded against, and that in every case the best rendering be adopted. Things which in the translation of another book would be of small importance, here assume very great magnitude, because the matter in hand is the Word of God—that Word through which we are saved and by which we are to be judged."² Yet Rev. Mr. Chambers and his brethren have no scruple not merely to tolerate, but to give the aid of positive approval to a revision in which they know that the best readings were not adopted, but erroneous readings, which in the Word of God cannot be trifles, were carried against their protest by the votes of an English majority! It will scarcely be denied that by their conduct they have assumed, as Rev. Mr. Chambers would say, a "very great magnitude" of responsibility before God. Before man, their course does not appear very consistent with honesty and fair dealing. We hope that self-respect will in future restrain these men from harping on the "pious frauds"³ of Bellarmine, Sixtus V., and Clement VIII., and "their clumsy, disingenuous efforts"⁴ to hide the truth in the matter of the Sixtine and Clementine recensions.

The Revision is now before the public. It is by no means final, for there is no doubt it will have its successors. But, as far as it

¹ So says one of their number, Rev. Talbot W. Chambers (Dutch Reformed), in his "Companion to the Revised Old Testament." New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1885. P. 169.

² Chambers, "Companion to Revised Old Testament," pp. 49, 50.

³ Canon Westcott, History of the Latin Vulgate, in Smith's "Biblical Dictionary," vol. iii.

⁴ Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D. (Scotch Presbyterian, and another of the Revisers), "Old Testament Revision; a Handbook for English Readers." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883. P. 335.

goes, is it a success? The judgment of the multitude seems to have been unfavorable, for the new edition excited very little curiosity, and certainly no enthusiasm. But, leaving aside public opinion, which is founded too often on fashion or irrational motive, we may ask whether the Revision has been really—what its very name and alleged purpose would lead us to expect—an honest effort to improve the old version by ridding it of its blemishes and shortcomings, whether involuntary errors or deliberate sins of mistranslation? No impartial critic can fail to answer in the negative. Much has been done, and this deserves its share of praise. Especially in the New Testament, many, very many, and, it may be said, nearly all the wilful perversions of God's Word for sectarian purposes, have been duly corrected. Even in matters of mere narrative involving no doctrine, the false readings of the *Textus Receptus* have been properly discarded for those of older and purer texts, of which the Latin Vulgate is a faithful representative. Corrupt additions, too, which had crept from the margin into the text, and had been so firmly imbedded there as to be made into shibboleths of Protestantism, were ousted from their usurped place of honor, and declared to be, what they were, words of men, and not of God's inspiration. Such was the famous doxology in St. Matthew (Chapter vi.), for refusing to recite which as part of God's Word Catholic children have been scourged in our public schools. This is no figure of speech, but an actual fact, which took place in Boston, not long before the war, and which was chronicled in the daily papers at the time.¹ The young hero, who suffered stripes for the sake of God's pure Word, was, if not a truer Christian, certainly a better Biblical scholar than his teachers or the whole Boston School Board. May we hope that he still lives to enjoy whatever satisfaction can be derived from the testimony of the best Protestant scholars of England and America, proclaiming to the world that the Catholic child, taught by the traditions of his fathers, was right and King James' Bible wrong.

But, although the revised New Testament of King James was laudably purged of much of its sectarian dross,—we are using a

¹ We cannot pretend, at this late date, to recall the exact year in which this happened. It must have been between 1854 and 1859, when Know-Nothingism was rampant in many parts of the country, and especially in New England. The wicked spirit of this faction, which delighted not only in scourging our children, but in burning our churches and murdering Catholics in cold blood, out of hatred to their religion, would have had a much longer triumph, and might have succeeded in organizing a general persecution at the North, had not bigotry been forced to succumb before self-interest. It would have been poor policy to make enemies of Catholic soldiers when they were needed to fill the ranks of those who came down to invade, coerce, and desolate the unhappy South.

very mild phrase,—yet some of it remained. It was passed over, either inadvertently, because unnoticed, or retained upon deliberate reflection, out of that miserable spirit of compromise which could find no better way of showing its gratitude for permission to adopt some better reading from *Codices* Aleph, A or B in one place, than by allowing anti-Catholic corruptions to remain in others. In no other way can we explain some uncorrected passages; as, for example, the slur upon Catholic saints and the honor we owe them, never intended by St. Luke and St. James, but wickedly put into their mouths by heretical zeal, in Acts xiv., 15, and James v. 17. Saints Paul and Barnabas are made to say of themselves, and St. James of the prophet Elias, that they were “*men of like passions*,” “*subject to like passions*,” as ourselves and other men. Now, in the mouth of a Catholic, this might have a most orthodox sense; in the mouth of the Genevan Calvinist, who first used the expression, it could have no good meaning. It is the same hateful spirit in which, when we venerate the relics of saints and martyrs, they tell us, as did the Pagans of old, that we worship dead men’s bones. In the same way, to dishonor God’s friends whom we honor, they say and, if they could, would force Scripture to say: You are worshippers of mere men who are no better than yourselves, having the same passions as you have, whether Christians or heathen.¹

Who would have imagined that so much venom could be got out of the innocent little word, *ὁμοιοπαθής*? To the Catholic, it furnishes matter for edification, to the Calvinist, a handle for reviling the Saints of God. One can scarcely help recalling the beautiful lines of Metastasio, describing the different way in which the bee and the serpent turn to account the same sweet flower. The Greek term most frequently is used as synonymous with *ὁμοιότητος*, or its primitive, *ὁμοιος*, “like;” or, if we wish to retain the full etymological meaning, it may be rendered “liable to like infirmities,” such as pain, sickness, death, etc. The word “*passions*,” and all of wickedness that lurks behind it, came from the workshop of Geneva. Luther is innocent of this perversion, for he translates in James, “Elias war ein Mench *gleichwie* wir,” and, in Acts, “wir sind auch *sterbliche* Menchen *gleichwie* ihr.” It was Calvin who, in his translation and commentary, deliberately gave the keynote which was faithfully taken up by his disciples. The English exiles of Geneva,

¹ Saints Paul and Barnabas were addressing Pagans, who were in the very act of committing idolatry (Acts xiv., 15).

² “We are, even, men, subject to like passions, that ye be” (Acts xiv., 15). “Elias a man, subject to like passions, as we be” (James v., 17).

the Spanish,¹ Italian² and French³ translators, all believed it right and proper to force into the text of the New Testament this novel teaching of their newly-adopted pontiff and lawgiver. It may be said that the word *passions* can be understood in a philosophical sense (τα πάθη or παθήματα). It might by a philosopher or learned student; it is not so understood by the common reader. Nor was it the intention of those artful depravers of God's Word. They wished to disparage in the mind of the reader the great heroes whom the Catholic Church holds in such high esteem and veneration, and to flatter him with the thought that Elias, Barnabas, Paul and other great saints are no better than himself. Calvin does not attempt to conceal what was meant by his novel translation, which, in his Latin Commentary, reads as follows: "Elias homo erat passionibus similiter obnoxius ut nos,"—"Elias was a man, subject to passions in like manner as we are." Having thus introduced his gloss into the text under cover of translation, he further explains himself, substantially, as follows: James is here replying to the Catholic objection, that we are far from the degree of holiness possessed by Elias, and, therefore, cannot hope as much from our unworthy prayers. Hence, he lowers Elias to our standard and reminds us that he was a man subject to the same passions as ourselves. It is a mere fiction of the imagination to look upon the Saints as so many demigods or heroes, who enjoyed special intercourse with the Divinity. It is not only imagination, but profane

¹ "Elias era hombre sujeto a semejentes pasiones que nosotros" (James v., 17). In the Acts, he translates more rationally: "Mortales hombres semejentes a vosotros."

² Diodati, in the Acts, has "ancora noi siamo uomini sottoposti a medesime passioni come voi," and, in St. James, "Elia era uomo sottoposto a medesime passioni come noi." The former Italian translator of Geneva has the passage of Acts rendered in the very same words as Diodati, with the exception of *che* for *come*. In St. James, he reads "Elia era uomo sottoposto a simili passioni che noi," which is not much of an improvement.

³ The Genevan French of Hutter's Polyglot has had the good sense and decency to substitute a milder term for "passions." "Nous sommes aussi hommes sujets a mesmes affections que vous" (Acts, *I. c.*), and "Elie estoit homme sujet a semblables affections que nous" (St. James, *I. c.*). Ostervald has done better, in Acts: "des hommes sujets aux mêmes infirmités que vous," and, in St. James, "Elie etoit un homme sujet aux mêmes affections que vous." It is said that Ostervald's Bible has been lately revised and corrected, of which the New Testament (by M. Frossard), approved by a conference of French ministers, was published in 1869, and the Old Testament (revised by a committee of thirteen), in 1879. It is said, further, that this edition only will be circulated in future by the British and American Bible Societies. We hope Ostervald's doctrinal errors, derived from Calvin, Olivetan, and Beza, have been corrected. But, when we consider the liberal tendencies of modern French Protestantism, we fear that they have regarded these sectarian blemishes as too despicable to deserve attention, and that their whole study has been to purify critically the *Textus Receptus* of the New Testament, and to rationalize the Old, according to the latest requirements of "scientific" theology.

⁴ Io. Calvini in *Novum Testamentum Commentarii*. Edidit et præfatus est A. Tholuck, Berolini. 1834. Vol. vii., p. 384.

and Pagan superstition. And to drive it out of our minds, James would have us consider the Saints in the weakness of their flesh, that we may learn that it was not their merits but their prayers that obtained them a hearing. Hence, it is clearly seen what childish triflers are the Papists, who teach men to have recourse to the help of the Saints. We add Calvin's own words in the original Latin :

" Ne quis autem objiceret, longe nos distare a gradu Eliæ, eum collocat in nostro ordine, quum dicit hominem fuisse mortalem et iisdem nobiscum passionibus obnoxium. Nam ideo minus proficimus in sanctorum exemplis, quia ipsos fingimus semideos vel heroas, quibus peculiare fuerit cum Deo commercium ; ita ex eo quod exauditi sunt, nihil fiduciæ concipimus. Ut hanc ethnicam et profanam superstitionem Jacobus excutiat, sanctos in carnis infirmitate considerandos esse admonet, ut discamus non eorum meritis, sed orationis efficaciam tribuere, quod omnia a Deo impetrarunt. Hinc apparet quam pueriliter nugentur papistæ, qui ad sanctorum patrocinium confugere docent, quia exauditi fuerint a Domino," etc.—(*l. cit.*, p. 386).

This attempt of Calvin to read the mind and make out the purpose of St. James, by supposing him a fervent Protestant, replying in advance to possible Catholic objections, is not very complimentary to Luther, whose keen eye detected in the holy apostle a preacher of works, a teacher of papistical doctrine, and therefore contemptuously cast him out of the Canon. Hence, whoever would pin his faith to the authority of these two great founders of a purer Christianity will, owing to their disagreement, never be in a position to decide whether St. James was a Catholic or a Protestant. As far as it is a mere question of two erroneous conjectures, we should give the palm to Luther's wild guesswork, abstracting from its impiety. It takes no little boldness to affirm that Catholics are guilty of "profane, Pagan superstition," when they believe that it was given to God's saints to hold special intercourse with Him. In so believing, they but adhere to the strict historical truth of the Bible, which Calvin must either have never read, or found it convenient to forget. In its pages we are told how Abraham, Moses, the very Elias of whom St. James speaks, and others used to enjoy familiar converse with the Most High, He speaking to them "face to face, as a man is wont to speak to a friend."¹

¹ "Facie ad faciem, sicut solet loqui homo ad amicum suum" (Exod. xxxiii., 11). The familiarity to which the Lord deigned to admit Abraham is so well known from Genesis, and so wonderful, that, in the hymns and prayers of the Syriac Liturgy, his name is scarcely ever mentioned without the adjunct "Rohmeh d'Alloho,"—"The Friend of God." And God is still besought for mercy through his intercession, as frequently as through that of any other Saint, except His own Virgin Mother.

Calvin (to whose school may be traced most of the errors of King James' Bible) fell into the fatal mistake, so common to other Protestant interpreters of his day, of making his translation answer the purpose of a commentary, in other words, of adding, amplifying and so enforcing through the text what he conceived to be the too concisely or insufficiently expressed meaning of the sacred writer. Even where the added matter is true, few will venture to maintain that such a course can be reconciled with honesty or with due reverence for God's spoken or written Word. But what shall we say of him who professes and even boasts his own fallibility, and yet thrusts his private opinion into the sacred text, and as far as he can palms it off on the world as an oracle of God? And what must the Catholic feel who knows, with all the certainty of divine faith, that such opinion is neither probable nor even possible, but in direct contradiction with the doctrine taught by Him who is Truth itself, to His apostles and disciples? He can only shudder with horror at what he must hold to be downright sacrilege and blasphemy. The ancient Christians, even heretics with few exceptions, were singularly free from this wicked device. Both good and bad felt truly and deeply in their hearts—what is too often only on the lips of modern Bibliolatry—an unbounded reverence for the Word of God, which would not allow them to use it for unlawful purposes.

Catholics in the West might translate from the Greek for their own devotion, but they would never think of wilfully altering the text. If heretics attempted to translate for sectarian ends, they had to reckon with such formidable witnesses against them as the *Itala*, and subsequently the *Vulgate*, which had already preoccupied the ground—to say nothing of the Greek original, which was sufficiently within the reach of all persons of tolerable education. Luckily for them, there existed no temptation of translating the Scriptures for the first time into a vernacular tongue which was just emerging from barbaric forms into the light of literary polish and culture, or into which the Scriptures had not yet been translated. The Syriac version of the *Pshitto*, indeed, was made into a language which had never before known a translation of the Old or New Testament, and dates nearly from the time of the Apostles. But it was made by God-fearing Christian men, who had no systems of their own to build up, no private opinions for which God's Word in the vernacular might be cunningly made a vehicle, but simply the intention of faithfully spreading before their countrymen the divine oracles. Hence, we find that in the two passages under consideration, they translate simply and truthfully, as does the *Vulgate*, "passible (liable to infirmity or suffering) like you," and

"passible like us."¹ It was reserved for the wisdom of later days to manipulate the revealed Word so skilfully that readers of the vernacular, instead of wading through commentaries, should be enabled to find in the text itself, more or less plainly, justification by faith alone, the idolatry of honoring the Saints and reverencing their relics and pictures, the absurdity of confession, fasting, and mortification; in a word, all the salient points of doctrine in which the new Gospel differed from the Church of sixteen centuries.

They could now well afford to clothe with some poor semblance of truth their boasted promise of giving the world (what Rome did not) a free, pure Bible, without note or comment, since they had secured, in the artfully prepared text, a stealthy commentary which, while avoiding that odious name, was sufficient to warp the judgment of ignorant or incautious readers. The promise, hitherto, had been an empty boast, false in fact, and insincere in the mouths of those who uttered it. History tells us how they acted from the very beginning of the "Reformation." They clamored without ceasing that Scripture was all-sufficient, that it was the only guide of doctrine and life, and which abundantly explained itself, without need of an interpreter. But, how little they believed of all this, is clear from the way in which they filled their vernacular Bibles with notes, which taught the reader what to find in the text, and what to infer from it. We all know what use Luther made of his *Randglossen* (marginal notes) to prop up his mistranslations, and what zealous imitators of his example were the English Calvinists. It is needless to say that these notes contained much false doctrine and perverse interpretations of Scripture. Still worse, they teemed with the fiercest expressions of anti-Catholic hate and bitterness: they breathed sedition, and piously suggested murder. The worst of them came from the pen of the fanatical Scotch and English exiles, who had found an asylum in Geneva. When, from well-grounded fear of these annotations, the prelatial party succeeded in persuading King James to issue a new version, without note or comment, it was only with reluctance that the Puritan divines consented. They were yet as "fond of annotations" as their predecessors of the sixteenth century, and wished "to follow the Geneva fashion." When, subsequently (under the Commonwealth),

¹ In Acts xiv., 15, "*Hhoshushe acwotcun*"; in James v., 17, "*Hhoshusho acwotan*." Rev. Dr. Murdock, a Presbyterian minister of New England, whose chief aim seems to show how he can improve his text by high-flown translation, renders the passage of St. James, "Elias was a man of sensations like us"; while, in Acts, he makes the Apostles tell the Pagan crowd, with all the elegant ease of the modern pulpit, "We are, also, frail mortals like yourselves."—New Testament; translated from the Syriac by James Murdock, D.D. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1879. Pp. 243, 419.

² See "Our English Bible," by John Stoughton, D.D. London: Relig. Tract Society. No date, but probably 1879 or 1880. P. 270.

they had their own way, they tried to displace the "prelatical Bible" of King James by a new translation, which, doubtless, would have been filled with notes of the Geneva pattern. The Cromwellian tyranny was too short to give time for the new translation; but they made the most of their early success (1644) by giving out an authorized edition of Puritan note and comment. It is futile to remark that this book, the "Assembly's Annotations," did not receive the formal sanction of the Presbyterian divines of Westminster. It was gotten up by their creatures in the Parliament, and sanctioned by that Assembly, which had taken the King's place in the Headship of the Church. The Episcopal faction was wiser in its reckoning. It believed that the Bible had been so well Protestantized by mistranslation, that it could be safely trusted to the unaided intelligence of the English reader. And, after a while, the Nonconformist or Puritan element of the English Church learned to take the same view, and renounce its love for an annotated Bible. And, at the present day, both factions alike agree in obtruding upon us, in season and out of season, as if we knew nothing of their past history, volumes of pious, pretentious talk (*gush*, the vulgar call it) about their love of "a pure Bible, without note or comment."

The revisers, in both places, have retained the old translation, though they give evidence of knowing better, by appending to the word "passions" the marginal note "*or nature*." This recourse to the margin is no real remedy for a mistranslation. It may impose on a few innocent scholars, who will think they see in it a candid confession of needed correction. Perhaps it is intended for this very purpose. But, for one scholar who reads the Bible, there are thousands and tens of thousands of ignorant readers who never will have a chance of seeing these marginal notes. They are never printed in the Bibles intended for general circulation. To say that one in ten thousand gives them, would be an exaggeration. Hence the only real advantage, for which the cause of truth is indebted to the revisers, is where they have cured mistranslation by altering King James' text. But there is another ill-use that can be made of the margin, and it is to be feared that the revisers have deliberately had recourse to it. There is scarcely a prophecy concerning our Saviour in the Old Testament that is not subject to peculiar difficulties, arising from various readings, and from the fact that the Jewish Masoreths have invariably preferred the reading less favorable to Christian argument. Sometimes the reading is so absurd that common sense may reject it at once, without any need of reference to the LXX, and Vulgate, or other ancient version. Now, as a rule, the revisers use the margin to commend the reading that is least favorable to Christian faith. They have had the hardihood,

to use no stronger term, to reproduce, in the margin of Psalms xxii., 17, the atrocious *Caari* (like a lion) of the corrupt Jewish text, instead of what all antiquity had found there, *Caru* or *Caaru* (they have "dug" or pierced).¹ The common people may not have a chance to see this variant in the margin; but that does not lessen the impiety of putting it there. Infidels and Rationalists will admire the bold step; and, with the growth of Liberal Christianity, so-called, the day may come when it will be transferred from the margin to the text.² Indeed, the principle laid down by the revisers, and vigorously pushed to its utmost extent by the American divines, of sticking throughout to the Masoretic recension, in spite of any old version, would justify such transfer even now.

The liberalistic tendency of the revisers appears from other considerations, and chiefly from what they neglected to do. They carried out pretty well their main purpose, which was to rid King James' Bible of those glaring faults of mistranslation which scandalized all Hebrew scholars, from a purely philological point of view. But it was no part of their purpose to correct doctrinal errors, or do away with the sectarian bias given to the text by their predecessors. The adroit handling of the Revealed Word, so as to make of it a vehicle for error, is a wicked science in which heresy has always excelled. But from Marcion down to our day, none have carried it to such perfection as Luther and Beza and the Calvinists who founded the English Church, whatever may have been their designation, High or Low, Anglican or Presbyterian. The lordly prelate on his episcopal throne was as skilled and unscrupulous in this black art, as the ranting gospeller or exiled non-conformist in Geneva or the Low Countries. But the experience of Luther and Beza, and the outcry raised by their forcible violation of the text, had not been lost upon these quickwitted disciples. They learned that to deface the text wantonly by adding to or taking away from it, is not always needed, and is beset by so many risks that it must be resorted to only in cases of extreme necessity. It is much better strategy to hide or efface the meaning intended by the sacred writer and required by the context or derived from perpetual tradition, by picking out meanings that would be simply possible in another context, or by selecting for the translation terms that will disguise or weaken the force of the

¹ This is, probably, the only wilful perversion in the entire Hebrew Bible. The Vulgate has "*Foderunt manus meas et pedes meos*,"—"They have dug my hands and my feet." Ps. xxi. (Hebr. xxii.), 17.

² Something similar came near happening under Puritan rule in England. In the days of the Commonwealth, when changes in the Bible were discussed, the Commission was charged with the inquiry, whether it might not be well to transfer some readings from the margin to the text, in the interests of Puritan orthodoxy, no doubt. See Stoughton, "*Our English Bible*," *l. c.*

passage, or by using any other artifice that will insinuate false doctrine or exclude at least the Catholic sense. It was in this spirit that the version of King James was conceived and executed; and many of its worst points are retained by the revisers, not because they were counted to be of any value, but rather because they were looked on with contempt as theological rubbish by our high-minded Rationalistic correctors.

It may be well to illustrate this by an example or two. In Daniel iv., 24 (*al.* 27) the holy prophet urges the proud Heathen monarch to make amends for his past sins by almsgiving. So says the original Chaldee,¹ and so say with one accord the ancient versions. The Latin Vulgate has "*Peccata tua eleemosynis redime et iniquitates tuas misericordiis pauperum.*" "Redeem thy sins by alms-deeds and thy iniquities by works of mercy to the poor." This wore an ugly look for men who had made up their minds that good works were only "filthy rags," useless and even hurtful to salvation, according to the new gospel. Accordingly, it was altered as follows: "Break off thy sins by righteousness and thy iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." But there could be no doubt that the passage taught what Daniel and the people of God in his day believed (Tobias xii., 8), and what the New Testament and the unchanging tradition of the Church has ever held. Works of charity and mercy, especially to the poor, are wholesome for the just and for sinners. In the former it causes grace to abound still more; it helps the latter to obtain mercy and forgiveness. This is the doctrine repeated on the pages of our Lord's Gospel and in the preaching of His inspired Apostles. It is the merciful who are to obtain mercy; he who forgives shall be forgiven; he who feeds the needy shall be recompensed at the resurrection of the just; he who ministers to the poor has Christ himself for the recipient of his bounty; even a cup of cold water will not fail of its reward. We are all God's debtors, and our indebtedness is cancelled by forgiving our neighbor's debts and trespasses in our own regard. We have dealt wrongly by our Lord and Master; we redeem our injustice by giving freely to Christ in the person of His poor. For He counts as done to Himself whatever we do to the least of His brethren. Whoever has not learnt this from the New Testament, has read it to very little advantage. To any one, therefore, who is satisfied with the plain teaching of Christ and His apostles in the New Law, there can be no difficulty, nothing strange or unexpected in this passage of Daniel. But heresy cannot tolerate Catholic language in Daniel or Moses any more than in the Apostles St. Paul or St. James.

Did St. Jerome render the words of the prophet correctly? Un-

¹ This portion of Daniel is in Aramaic, generally known as "Biblical Chaldee."

questionably; and all the ancient versions—Greek, Syriac and Arabic—bear testimony to his accuracy. So, too, do the learned Rabbins Iacchiades (R. Joseph Iachya), Aben Ezra and Saadias, who represent not only the Jewish *consensus* of their day (the fifteenth, twelfth and tenth centuries, respectively), but also the traditions of their earliest fathers. Candid Protestants, who spurn party dictation, like Grotius and Louis de Dieu, find no fault with St. Jerome's version. Impartial lexicographers, like Gesenius, who do not allow their learning to be clouded by sectarian prejudice, lay it down as certain that, in the text, *phruk* (imperative of *phrak*) means *redeem*, and *Ssidka*, *almsgiving*. The very parallelism or consonance of the two members,

"Redeem thy sins by almsgiving,
And thy iniquities by mercy to the poor,"

strongly confirms the soundness of the old renderings. Why, then, did all the "Reformers," from Luther to King James, translate wrongly? An honest Protestant confesses the reason. He says, that all translators render "break off by righteousness" or "redeem by almsdeeds," just in proportion as they believe good works to be useless or conducive to salvation; in other words, as they hold the Protestant or Catholic view of the meritoriousness of works. Now, we will take his word against his brethren, whom he accuses of translating according to their prejudices. For, all the versions with which we find fault were made after the "Reformation," and to bolster up its doctrines. But we cannot understand how his word can apply against Catholic translations, for they were made long ago, one of them (the *LXX*), nearly two thousand years before the Protestant doctrine of faith and works was known or thought of in the world.

But, why did the revisers retain the error of King James in Daniel? For the same reason that they retained the mistranslations of Genesis iv., 7 and Genesis xiv., 18, which were intended to shut out from the text the Catholic doctrine that concupiscence and sin have no absolute mastery over free-will, and that there is a connection of lofty import (almost surpassing any attempt at interpretation, as St. Paul intimates, Hebrews v., 11) between Melchisedech's priesthood and his sacrifice of bread and wine. It is not anti-Catholic feeling, we feel sure, that prompted their action, or rather their unwillingness to act, but downright contempt of these petty sectarian matters. They either hold that the Bible teaches nothing concerning these points, or, if it does, that we are not to be fettered by the private notions of Matthew, James, Peter and John, which may be allowed or dismissed, as his better judgment will direct, by the enlightened theologian of to-day. Protestantism has at its back church revenues and social advantages which

deserve respect; but its positive teaching, having accomplished its work of humbling Roman supremacy, is no longer needed. In fact, its orthodox views, wherever they survive, are as bigoted as Rome's, and stand in the way of those who would like to handle the miracles, prophecies and other mythical portions of the Old Testament, that we should like to submit to scientific exegesis, as freely as is done on the Continent of Europe. But the orthodoxy or bigotry, by which we are surrounded, compels us to wear a mask until the happy day comes when speech will be as free for us as thought.

The next revision of the English Bible will be issued on this side of the Atlantic, and will contain the improvements of the American side of the Commission, many of them very sensible, many more distinguished even now by a bold neology, which will have become akin to open impiety by the time the expiration of the English bargain will leave the press free for an American Revised Bible, which will undermine still further all respect for divine inspiration. In an enterprise like this, all is progress towards the abyss; its practical motto, *Vestigia nulla retrorsum*. So it will be everywhere. Luther's German Bible, in a revised form, is now on trial before the people of Germany. It was thought that his bold language and dogmatical corruptions would be carefully corrected. All have been disappointed, Catholic and Protestant. The main point of the revisers seems to have been to break down the force of all the Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament. And this is the result of great expectations, magnificent promises, and years of weary waiting.

Scientific Chronicle.

SCIENTIFIC EDUCATION.

ONE of the many signs of scientific progress in our day is the lively interest taken in scientific education. Love for the sciences is no longer confined to the few, but has now become widespread and ever increasing; efforts are everywhere being made to render scientific education more practical and more general. Europe and America are making great strides to this end, and indeed seem to respond eagerly to the call which Sir Lyon Playfair made upon England last Summer, in his opening address at Aberdeen, before the British Association. It was his claim "that the relation of science to the State should be more intimate, because the advance of science is needful to public weal;" and his words had all the more weight in that he spoke not only as a man of science, but also as a statesman. Further on in the same address he used these words: "In the United Kingdom we are just beginning to understand the wisdom of Washington's farewell address to his countrymen when he said, 'Promote, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge.'" Here, restricting this last word to physical and natural sciences, Sir Lyon Playfair passes on to the consideration of scientific growth in various countries. He dwells at some length on the energetic efforts made in France and Germany, and notices with pleasure the pecuniary assistance they have lent. Of our own country he said: "More remarkable is it to see a young nation, like the United States, reserving 150,000,000 acres of national land for the promotion of scientific education. In some respects this young country is in advance of all European nations in joining science to its administrative offices." In confirmation of this last assertion he cites the work of the Fish Commission and the Geological Survey.

But his great point in this discourse was to emphasize the urgent necessity of scientific education. From the example of Continental Europe and our own country he goes on to show that the great English Universities—far advanced though they be—have not the support and encouragement of which they are certainly deserving. As instances of the liberality of other countries, he mentions the Universities of Strasbourg and Leipsic, each of which receives from the State £10,000 more than the Universities of either Ireland or Scotland. Words such as these should make us thoughtful and fill us with new life in a noble cause. Gratifying though it is to see that our work is held in esteem abroad, and that our efforts as a nation to promote scientific knowledge are looked upon with pleasure and highly appreciated, still we should bear in mind that there is yet much to be done. True, on account of peculiar circumstances, our Universities are not supported by the

National Government, nor is it desirable that they should be ; still they are prospering and making progress, especially in the physical and natural sciences. And this is seen not only at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Pennsylvania Universities, but also in the younger institutions, as the Johns Hopkins and others. One and all show a common energy and vitality, and there is every prospect of a glorious future, especially if what we have lately heard be true, that California is to have a new University with a foundation of \$20,000,000, the gift of Senator Stanford. Everywhere new and costly buildings spring up for scientific purposes ; everywhere new museums, new libraries and laboratories for physics, chemistry, and biology, numerous and well-equipped observatories are scattered over the land, and not a few of them have gained a world-wide reputation. The National Observatory and the Lick Observatory at Mt. Hamilton, Cal., are, or soon will be, provided with powerful telescopes, and their work, like that of our Cambridge Observatory, is second to none.

What we say of scientific progress in our Universities, holds good likewise for our colleges and schools ; for they, too, have given the sciences a place in the regular course. Indeed, it must be granted that in many cases the enthusiasm in this direction has led to excess either in the method or in the matter, an excess that has been oftentimes fraught with regretful results ; but for the most part the change is being brought about skilfully and quietly, and each day tells the story that the good work is fast gaining ground. All that wealth and untiring efforts can do is being done to promote scientific education, and give it a place along with the more purely literary studies of our schools.

Our Catholic institutions, as the Report of the Smithsonian shows, —and since that Report the advance is still more marked,—follow the general movement ; and though the efforts in this respect are not yet as energetic as many lovers of science would have them, still there is a progress, and we have every reason to cherish bright hopes of the future. It is greatly to be desired that Institutions may soon rise up among us that will rank among the highest and be illustrious for the excellence of their scientific course. It must, beyond doubt, be evident to all how important it is that we should hold a prominent place in this line ; for as the learned Benedictine, Cardinal Pitra, justly remarked about a year ago, “ It is good that the clergy, who have in their theology the key to all the sciences, should neglect none of them, and we ought also to have our specialists. . . . it is important that, with a rich store of the science of the Sanctuary, the clergy should not be strangers to that other knowledge of which the world is proud. . . . There is in these studies, which are dry at first sight, pure and healthy delight, which grows towards enthusiasm in the measure in which one cultivates with perseverance the at first thorny field. It is well that the clergy should consecrate their leisure and spare energies to these labors.”

ASTRONOMY.

NEW STAR IN ANDROMEDA.

The phenomena of "Nova Andromedæ" that for the past few months have so much engaged the attention of astronomers, seem at length capable of a satisfactory explanation. The nebula in Andromeda is one of the largest and most conspicuous in the heavens. On favorable nights it is visible to the naked eye and has the "appearance of a faint oval patch of silvery light." Viewed through a small telescope, it answers the description that Marius gave of it in 1614, namely: It resembles a light seen through a piece of horn. In the opinion of some astronomical authorities, the nebula of Andromeda has a tendency to be resolved into stars, but though several hundreds of stars have been detected within its limits, it cannot be distinctly resolved even by such telescopes as Lord Rosse's, the one at Pulkowa, or that at Washington. It is, therefore, classed among the unresolved nebulae. Still the spectroscope seems to indicate what was suspected from telescopic appearances, namely, that this nebula is in an intermediate state between nebulae proper and star clusters. For, unlike most of the nebulae, its spectrum is not a bright-band spectrum, but rather a continuous one, resembling that of a gas at high pressure. Hence we are led to believe that the nebula in question is in an intermediate state, and that, according to Laplace's hypothesis, it is a nebular mass slowly condensing into stars.

Towards the end of August, as is well known, a new star became visible near the nucleus of the nebula. The star's appearance was very sudden; for the nebula was closely examined at Brussels, at the beginning of August, without anything being perceived, while a few days later several observers found that its central portion was growing brighter. This unexpected phenomenon at once attracted the closest attention, and everywhere both spectroscope and telescope were directed to its investigation. The suddenness of the change could not at all be reconciled with the gradual formation of centres, in accordance with the Laplace theory, which, notwithstanding several difficulties accompanying it, is generally admitted by astronomers.

All were, therefore, anxious to know whether such a transformation was, in truth, taking place. At first, it was with difficulty that the star could be distinguished from the nucleus of the nebula, but when its brightness reached that of a star of the seventh magnitude it was seen to be distinct from it. It is now growing less bright, at the rate of one magnitude every three weeks, its lustre being at present (early in December) equal to that of a star of the eleventh magnitude.

In the beginning, the spectroscope indicated that the star belonged to the nebula, because its spectrum and that of the nebula appeared to be identical. But a closer examination, made by Dr. Higgins, of London, and confirmed at other observatories, as at Stonyhurst, seems to show that a bright-band spectrum was overlying a continuous spectrum between the lines D and d, and this appearance leads to the opinion

that "Nova Andromedæ" is a star only optically connected with the nebula, that is, a temporary star—possibly a periodic one—which lies in the direction of the nebula, but altogether independent of it.

PHYSICS AND CHEMISTRY.

ELECTRICAL FURNACES AND THE ALUMINIUM COMPOUNDS.

The introduction of electrical furnaces seems to point to a radical change in the metallurgy of many useful metals. The experiments already made, though on a comparatively small scale, have worked a great change in the production of aluminium compounds.

Until lately, the usefulness of electricity in metallurgy, because confined to the decomposition of solutions of metallic salts, was necessarily limited. Siemens, Depretz, and a few others, advanced a step further towards the accomplishment of what now seems within reach. These scientists endeavored to utilize in the reduction or melting of metals the intense heat of the electric arc. But their success was not very marked, at least from a commercial point of view. A short time ago, however, Messrs. Cowles, of Cleveland, now of the "Cowles' Electric Smelting and Aluminium Company," obtained results which surpass anything thought of before in that line. Their method, adopted after many and rigorous tests, is substantially the following. The ore to be reduced is placed, together with broken carbon, in a fire-clay retort. Then, a powerful current generated by a dynamo is allowed to pass through it. The great resistance offered by the mixture raises the temperature to such a degree that the ore is reduced. As the amount of resistance offered by the carbon may vary in the course of the operation, great care must be taken not to injure the generator. This may be readily effected by shunting the current, and inserting a duly regulated resistance-coil. Besides, to insure greater safety, an Ammeter is so arranged as to measure the intensity of the current at any moment. The current, as it passes through the retort thus provided, produces, as we have said, an extremely high temperature. By thus transforming great electrical energy into heat, and confining it within a small space, we may raise the temperature almost indefinitely. For the height to which it can be raised depends solely on the force of the dynamos and the degree of infusibility possessed by the substance used in making the furnace.

An incalculable amount of motive power might be given to the dynamos from waterfalls. Hence, we are not surprised at finding that the above-mentioned Company contemplate vast projects in this direction.

In some of the first experiments, the heat became so intense that the interior of the furnace itself was fused. This inconvenience has been remedied by surrounding with more of the mixture of carbon and the ore to be reduced the space between the electrodes, where the greatest heat is had. Thus all the heat is brought to bear on the mixture, and not on the furnace.

By means of this process lumps of lime and some corundum have been melted. The molten masses crystallized on cooling into long and well-

defined crystals. Many oxides, that have hitherto been considered almost incapable of decomposition, have been successfully acted upon; thus, among others, the oxides of aluminium, silicon, boron, manganese, magnesium, sodium, and potassium have been already decomposed.

To show the practical and commercial utility of this very ingenious invention, we might mention many valuable compounds already obtained; such, for example, as the boron and silicon bronzes, this latter being, of all known substances, the best adapted for telegraph and telephone wires. But we limit ourselves for the present to the aluminium alloys. Pure aluminium is, perhaps, one of the most useful metals, because of its lightness, tenacity, and beautiful color. It is, moreover, of common occurrence, being the base of all clays. It has not, as yet, been obtained by the electrical method. The reason is, that pure aluminium and carbon unite somewhat readily; as soon, then, as the pure aluminium finds itself in the furnace alone with the carbon which was placed in it as a resisting and reducing medium, it at once combines with it, yielding a compound similar to pig-iron. This substance, hitherto not well studied, promises to prove very serviceable. The aluminium alloys have, in proportion, the same useful qualities that aluminium itself possesses. Of late, aluminium-silver and aluminium-bronze, obtained by the process of the French chemist Deville, could be purchased at fifteen dollars per pound. Now, thanks to the ingenious contriver of the electrical furnace, this same silver and bronze costs only five dollars per pound. This reduction will, no doubt, further increase; but even at present cost these alloys, because of their lightness and strength, are almost invaluable for many purposes. Thus, the 10 per cent. aluminium-bronze (10 per cent. aluminium and 90 per cent. copper) whose color is that of gold, besides being capable of holding out against a tensile strain of 109,000 pounds to the square inch, is so hard and durable as to stand more wear and tear than any metal now in use. The 5 per cent. bronze, though not quite so strong, hardly tarnishes in the air, while the 2 per cent. and 3 per cent. bronzes are stronger than brass. The Hercules metal, an alloy of copper, nickel, and aluminium, stands a strain of more than 111,000 pounds to the square inch. A little aluminium added to brass doubles its strength. We might here mention other compounds, but the results arrived at by recent study are not yet fully known.

DECOMPOSITION OF DIDYMIUM.

This discovery, by no means of so great practical importance as the preceding, is from a theoretical point of view of very great moment. The "*Chemiker Zeitung*" gives an account of a memoir, presented by Dr. C. A. von Welsbach to the Vienna Academy of Science, in which he announces that didymium, one of the rare metals, results from the union of two substances, whose properties are altogether different. Nor was this decomposition wholly unexpected. In fact, the broadly-fluted absorption bands produced by the chloride of this metal are similar to those of blood, or of magenta, and recall to mind the wide, bright lines in the spectrum of the calcium salts and the carbon compounds.

This is not the first time that so-called chemical elements have been decomposed. At the beginning of the present century Davy split up the hydrates of sodium and potassium, till then considered as elements.

But the interest attaching to the decomposition of didymium is particularly great, because it recalls to mind the speculation advanced about seven years ago, according to which the bodies that we call chemical elements are all made up of a few elementary substances,—and even, perhaps, of a single one in different allotropic states. This opinion, as is quite evident, is of vast import not only to the chemist, whose science, did it prove true, would have to be reorganized, but also to metaphysicians, who at the present day make so much of anything that bears on the composition of bodies. It was Lockyer who, comparing the spectra of different metals in order to ascertain the presence of their absorption lines in the sun-spectrum, first formulated this theory. It has not, however, so far as we know, been yet embraced by any chemist of note. Still the plausible reasons on which it is based have not yet been positively disproved.

Examining the spectra of several metals at different temperatures, Lockyer found that they often vary, as do the iron spectra, when seen at a very high temperature in the solar chromosphere and in the protuberances, or when seen at a much lower temperature in the solar spots. Hence he was led to consider the iron spectrum of our laboratories as formed by the superposition of two distinct spectra, the iron vapors having different temperatures in different parts of the electric spark. Then by a series of experiments and a course of reasoning, too long to be here set forth, he reached the conclusion that iron, with many other metals, and, perhaps, with all the other "elements," is probably composed of more elementary substances; which, though separated by dissociation at high temperatures—as happens in the solar protuberances,—remain united at lower temperatures, as may be seen in the solar spots. The discovery recently made with regard to didymium evidently lends some support to this view. Its spectrum, already studied by Gladstone, Thalén and others, has been found so similar to that of iron that the two metals, though otherwise very different, are classified together. This circumstance seems to give additional probability to the opinion that iron, and perhaps all other allied metals, are also compounds. The fact, too, that didymium has been decomposed, not by dissociation at a high temperature, but by ordinary chemical means, opens a new field of inquiry that may in the end determine whether the so-called chemical elements are really simple or not.

COMPOSITE PHOTOGRAPHY.

In August, 1877, Mr. Francis Galton, F.R.S., laid before the scientific societies of England an account of a new form of light-writing, which he termed Composite Photography. Four years later he published a paper on the same subject, having in the meantime modified and improved his process. This process has attracted great attention

of late in scientific circles, especially on account of the attempts of others to repeat it.

It may prove interesting to our readers to follow Mr. Galton, as he sets himself to study "the varied hereditary faculties of different men and to note the great difference in different families and races." But here one may ask, how shall we get at these characteristics of a race? Evidently by examining individuals. As from the dwelling we may form a pretty just estimate of the social standing its inmates enjoy, so from a glance at the soul's dwelling we may get an idea of its intellectual character. If, then, we obtain a general knowledge of the countenances of individuals,—for it is in the features that the soul's expression is chiefly found,—we may be said to have the general or typical character of a race.

To extract the common element from many faces alike in most respects, is the problem. This for the unaided eye is next to impossible. The stereoscope would remove the difficulty in part by superposing two pictures, thereby doubling the common element and rendering it more prominent. A battery of magic lanterns, say nine in number, so arranged as to throw their disks of equal brightness on exactly the same part of the screen, would give better results. For, by introducing into each lantern slides of the faces we wish to examine, we would have nine images blended into one. What is common to all would have the full brilliancy; what is found in three would be but one-third as brilliant, consequently less noticeable, and what belongs to one alone would have the light of but one lantern and would be comparatively out of notice.

By this means we would obtain the type or generic portrait of nine different individuals. But from nine it would not be just to judge of a race. In order, then, to superpose many pictures, Mr. Galton had recourse to Photography. His first care was to choose portraits of the same general character. The lighting and pose of the head should be the same in all; similar pose, for the common features should come out as nearly together as possible; like lighting, for different lights, even on one subject, give sometimes marvellously different results. We must not look for a composite, as the union is termed, remarkably well-defined; not at all, for that would suppose the genus without its differences. The portraits being selected, fiducial or guide-lines are drawn on the ground glass of the camera. Galton's guides are two horizontal lines, passing, one through the points of contact of the lips, the other through the pupils of the eyes.

We have now the subjects arranged and centred; next comes the exposure,—each portrait is in turn placed before the sensitive plate of the camera, and allowed to act upon it for a very short time. The exact duration necessary for each of these momentary exposures will vary with the depth of tone of the print to be copied, but should be so proportioned as to give each of the objects an equal share in the result. The development is the same as for ordinary negatives. Living subjects may also be taken, and, perhaps, with more pleasing results, using always the guide-lines to superpose the most expressive features of the face, the

eyes, and the mouth. Thus we obtain a type, a generic picture, one that resembles many, but is really the portrait of no single one.

Some very interesting studies, thus obtained, were exhibited by Galton; notably, a composite of consumptives, and a remarkable one of convicts. The latter does not give the "typical criminal," but the man inclined to crime, since we get that which underlies the varieties of criminal expression. Many details of ingenious manipulation,—especially the method of simplifying reiterated focusing,—might be given, but would not, perhaps, be of interest to the general reader. Those who desire fuller information on the subject are referred to Galton's "Inquiry into the Human Faculty."

GEOLOGY.

FLOOD ROCK EXPLOSION AS AN ARTIFICIAL EARTHQUAKE.

Among the great problems of geological study still under discussion, is that of ascertaining the interior constitution of our globe; and to the solving of this has been brought the testimony of all the volcanic and seismic phenomena which scientists have been able to investigate. Of these, that of earthquakes has excited a more than scientific interest, in view of the immense loss to life and property resulting from the terrible earth-shakings of 1884 in Spain, and of 1883 at Krakatao. In connection with the late explosion at Flood Rock, in the East River, a number of observations have been made which will certainly prove of interest, and, possibly, of some scientific value in this regard. The theory of earthquake-communication, accepted upon thoroughly well-established grounds, is briefly this: From the origin of disturbance, as a centre, are propagated, spherically, a series of alternate compressions and re-acting expansions, closely analogous to the waves of sound and of light, and exhibiting with them the characteristic phenomena of reflection, interference and refraction; these, in consequence of the analogy, have very properly been styled earth-waves. Now, if we consider a series of such shell-like waves arising from a focus beneath the surface, it will be seen that the surface cuts them, as any plane would cut a sphere, and plane circles of disturbance are the result, so that the effect produced upon the surface is as if a series of circular waves were propagated in all horizontal directions, with a common centre at a point on the surface vertically over the focus. This supposes a homogeneous medium. Of course, if the medium be more elastic in one direction than in that perpendicular to it, the wave will move elliptically; and if the elasticity in one direction be made null, the wave-direction reduces to a line. Now, one of the problems proposed is to determine the velocity with which these surface-waves travel; for, when the focus is not far below the ground, their velocity and that of the spherical waves may be taken to coincide. Mallet, of the British Association, the distinguished authority on seismic subjects, long since experimented with the distant explosion of a keg of gunpowder buried in the ground, timing the shock felt, and comparing with the time of explosion as transmitted

to him by telegraph. He announced as the result of his experiments that the velocity of the earth-wave was 825 feet per second in sand, 1225 in slate, and 1665 in granite. These experiments were, of a necessity, on a small scale. The late explosion at Flood Rock, however, offered a unique opportunity for similar observation, one that could scarcely be excelled, save by a natural earthquake. Flood Rock is, or was,—for it is now no more,—an island in Long Island Sound, of about nine acres in extent, and containing some 275,000 cubic yards of solid rock, which was to be sundered with explosives, and reduced to fragments of a size for dredging. The agents used were dynamite and rackarock, the latter being a highly explosive mixture of powdered chlorate of potash and coal-oil or tar. The amount of blasting material used in the mine summed up 290,000 pounds, nearly 150 tons, and, had gunpowder been the agent, five times that weight would have been required. Now, when this was ignited by means of an electric spark, which caused the simultaneous explosion of the entire quantity wherewith the mine was charged, and the rock was disrupted with a dull roar, and an immense mass of water was hurled up into the air, to a height of nearly 200 feet, the accompanying shock might not unnaturally be compared with a diminutive earthquake. To note the time of communication of the earth-tremor, General Abbot, of the Engineer Corps, established on Long Island a line of points of observation, all of which communicated by telegraph with the scene of the explosion, as well as with one another. Moreover, some fourteen observatories, within a radius of 200 miles, were on the watch for the trembling of the earth. Add to this, that Professors F. W. Clarke, T. C. Mendenhall and H. M. Paul were stationed, the two former on Ward's Island, and the latter on Staten Island, to time the passing wave. The observing instruments used on the occasion were chiefly of two kinds,—the mercury-cup and the platinum-wire seismoscope. The former is simply a vessel of mercury, from the surface of which a pencil of light is reflected through a series of pin-holes in an opaque diaphragm, the slightest jarring of the mercury producing a perceptible blur in the projected image of the pin-holes. For greater delicacy this image is studied through an adjustable telescope, which is, itself, secured against all accidental displacement. The other method is with a seismoscope, of an improved form, according to the design of Mr. Kübel, the mechanician of the United States Geological Survey, and substantially amounts to keeping an electric circuit open by resting one of the connecting wires on the point of a needle so delicately balanced that the slightest tremor of the system moves it from its position of equilibrium, thereby allowing the wire-point to fall into a mercury-cup, and close the circuit. The current of the closed circuit produces the registry of the jar, and, in connection with a chronograph, will mark the precise second of its occurrence. Unhappily, an unavoidable delay of nearly fourteen minutes occurred in the discharge of the mine at Flood Rock, and some of the observers, either fancying that the event had taken place and the earth-wave had spent itself without reaching them, or mistaking for it a slight tremor, which, singularly

enough, happened to be felt almost coincidently with the previously determined time of the explosion, ceased to keep on the alert, and were caught unprepared when the shock really came. However, the passage of the wave was timed successfully at Harvard, Princeton, Columbia and Yonkers, at Ward's Island, and along the Long Island points; so that we may yet hope to have satisfactory deductions. There is a peculiar interest attached to the result, from the fact that, in 1876, at the Hallet's Point explosion, General Abbot's corps took like observations, and his report announced the velocity of the wave as from 5000 to 8000 feet per second. This differed so largely from the estimates of Mallet and others, that doubts were thrown upon its accuracy. The report of the present experiment is looked forward to with expectation as an arbiter of the correctness of the 1876 estimates. The results will be made public as soon as they can be correctly ascertained from all the reports received.

Book Notices.

SCEPSIS SCIENTIFICA; OR, CONFESSION OF IGNORANCE THE WAY TO SCIENCE: In an Essay of the Vanity of Dogmatizing and Confident Opinion. By *Joseph Glanvill, M.A.* Edited, with Introductory Essay, by *John Owen*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

This is the title of a book which was written in the latter half of the 17th century, and which is now republished. Its general character may be sufficiently concluded from its title, "*Scepsis Scientifica*." Although what is now "modern skepticism" was then but in its infancy, this advocate of doubt makes no slight progress along what is, at present, the beaten track of error. As a necessary step in his undertaking, he gives much of his space to attacking the Aristotelian philosophy, a system which is opposed to erroneous speculations, and which predominated in the schools outside the Church, even after the religion which had adopted it and preserved it from pagan teachers had been cast aside by the so-called Reformation. But this magnificent structure of human reason—one so opposed to the vagaries and errors of the intellect—could not long be retained in the study of those who "liked not to have God in their knowledge," and who, having first rejected the truths that are supernatural and revealed, next, by a gradual process, abandoned also the truths of the natural order, until it has come to pass, in our day, that leaders of skeptical thought assert all knowledge to be relative, mutable, and illusory, and the unchangeable truth to be an obsolete fiction.

It is manifest, therefore, that a book which prepares the way for such unsound and irrational conclusions can be no real cause of good to science. Nor is the absence of true and immutable principles concealed by a matchless beauty of style, as was the case with Hume, for the author's language is quaint, often affected, and decidedly short of classic perfection.

It must not be supposed, however, that the book contains nothing that is good, true, or useful; there are portions which show the author to have been an acute and vigorous thinker, and which are strikingly at variance with advanced skeptical opinions of to-day. Though he is opposed to whatever is Aristotelian, he yet adopts, perhaps unconsciously, much of the philosophical system he condemns. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the best portions of his work are those in which he reproduces the thoughts of the Grecian sage. To instance: "To say that God doth eminently contain all those effects in his glorious simple essence, that the creature can produce or act by such a faculty, power, or affection, is to affirm him to be what he is, Infinite. Thus to conceive that he can do all those things in the most perfect manner, which we do upon *understanding*, *willing*, and *decreeing*, is an apprehension suitable to his idea; but to fix on him the formality of *faculties*, or affections, is contradictory to his Divinity."

This is exactly the teaching of Aristotle, followed by the great schoolmen, who held that all the perfections of created natures are precontained, in an absolutely simple and preëminent manner, in the First Cause of those natures, but that no perfection of any creature can be affirmed of God in an identical and univocal sense.

The 22d chapter of the "*Scepsis Scientifica*" is an attempt to show that the Aristotelian philosophy is opposed to the doctrines of the Christian religion, and otherwise full of inconsistencies. The following charges are made without proof to sustain them: "[Aristotle] affirms that he [God] knows not particulars. He denies that God made anything, or can do anything but move the heavens. He affirms that it is not God, but nature, chance, and fortune that rule the world. That he is tied to the first orb, and preserves not the world, but only moves the heavens; and yet elsewhere, that the world and heavens have infinite power to move themselves. He affirms the soul cannot be separated from the body because it is its form. . . . That the soul perishes with the body, and that there is neither state nor place of happiness after this life is ended."

These accusations are misrepresentations of Aristotle's real teaching. The illustrious Grecian philosopher proves, with demonstrative force, that the First Cause of the universe is a supreme and all-powerful intelligence; that he freely produced the world according to a preconceived and infinitely wise plan. That, having produced it, he conserves and governs it with an eternal power and wisdom, and that his providence and universal efficiency reach even to, and influence, the most distant and comparatively most insignificant effect. It is true that Aristotle held that the world, though created, was yet produced *ab æterno*. But this nowise conflicts with, nor weakens the demonstrative efficacy of his doctrine that the world is completely an effect, and that its First Cause freely and intelligently produced it from nothing, albeit *ab æterno*.

It is a fact, worthy of reflection, that the highest and most comprehensive conceptions which Christian philosophers have derived from human reason to express the existence, nature, and attributes of the Deity, are nothing else than the unchangeable demonstrations of Aristotle. Of all past philosophers, it was most conspicuously Aristotle who investigated the highest rational truths, pursued them to their deepest and soundest conclusions, and finally rested our knowledge of these subjects upon its ultimate basis of irrefragable certainty. It ill becomes Christians, therefore, who have received from the Grecian sage what is best in the province of unaided human reason, to forget the source whence this golden inheritance of learning has been derived; far less does it become

them, from a misconception of what is taught in the writings of Aristotle, to turn upon him and charge him with doctrines so opposed to reason and common sense.

Among the profound and guiding thoughts which discover the master mind of the Greek philosopher, are those that he elaborated, and transmitted, from age to age, concerning the human soul; this he proves to be the formal and actuating principle of the body (*forma corporis*), a proposition which has been reaffirmed in a definition of the Church. But though he declares the human soul to be the actuating and life-giving principle of the body, he yet distinguishes it clearly from all inferior principles of activity and life; the human soul alone, differently from inferior active principles, has an intrinsic, distinct, and self-supporting existence; it exists *per se*. Hence, the intellectual soul alone can continue to exist when separated from the body. This doctrine, as is manifest, is far removed from teaching "that the soul perishes with the body." Aristotle, speaking the language of irrefutable reason, declares that the intellectual soul of man is a complete substance, capable of existence when separated from the body, and naturally imperishable.¹ Limiting his assertions to what is rigorously matter of proof, he does not discuss the question, what will be the positive state of the soul after death. As this inquiry regards a future contingency that depends upon the free will of God, and in respect to which God was not limited to one way of determining, it is an inquiry to which human reason cannot return a demonstrative answer, and of which it cannot attain certainty except by Divine Revelation. Hence, Aristotle, whose object was the apodictic truth, which is necessary, immutable, and such that its opposite is impossible, wisely restricts his utterances to a declaration of the soul's simple, spiritual, and imperishable nature. Though reason convinces us that the life of the soul is absolutely independent of second causes, and that the soul is intrinsically capable of an immortal existence, yet we can know only by supernatural and revealed truth what positive disposition God will make of the soul after death; we know by infused faith that the blessed enjoy forever the beatific vision, that there is the terminable state of purgatory, and the unending state of those who have averted themselves from their ultimate supernatural destiny. These are truths which our unaided faculties could not discover with certainty; nay, we could not even know that we are destined for a supernatural end unless it had been revealed; much less could we assert demonstratively the positive condition of those who have reached it, or of those who have failed to reach it.

Accordingly, to censure Aristotle because he did not know nor teach truths such as these, is unreasonably and unjustly to condemn him; it is, moreover, to confuse the two orders of truth, the natural and the supernatural, and irrationally to suppose that human reason can supersede

¹ "Aristotle, 2 De An., dicit quod intellectus separatur a cæteris sicut perpetuum a corruptibili."—Scotus, Dis. 4, 43, 2.

"Si autem aliquid manet posterius, perscrutandum est. In quibusdam enim nihil prohibet, ut si est anima tale, non omnis sed intellectus: omne namque impossibile forsan."—Aristotle, 12 Met. T. C., 16.

"Aristotle says that the intellectual soul is distinguished from lower principles of life, just as what is perpetual is distinguished from what is perishable."

"But whether any formal and essential principle of real substances remains [intrinsically unchanged] after [the dissolution of the compound] inquiry is to be made. For in some composite beings there is nothing to prevent [such principles from surviving], as, if a soul is of this nature, then not every soul will [survive the dissolution of this compound], but only the intellectual soul. For that every soul [should survive] is perhaps impossible."

the Christian Church in its precise and essential office of teaching men revealed truth in order to their ultimate and supernatural destiny.

The fundamental error of the book whose title heads this notice, is to set forth doubt as a leading principle of philosophy, and one applicable especially to the deeper questions that arise in this province of knowledge. It is manifest that when doubt is made one of the premises of any argument, the conclusion can enunciate only what is doubtful. A means of avoiding such spurious argumentation would have been a judicious and closer study of the peripatetic philosophy; this would have dispelled the doubts which the skeptical author professes on many subjects, and it would have deterred him from imputing to Aristotle errors that the Stagirite did not defend.

THE CHAIR OF PETER; OR, THE PAPACY CONSIDERED IN ITS INSTITUTION, DEVELOPMENT AND ORGANIZATION, AND IN THE BENEFITS WHICH, FOR OVER EIGHTEEN CENTURIES, IT HAS CONFERRED ON MANKIND. By *John Nicholas Murphy, Roman Count*, author of "Terra Incognita." Popular Edition, with Much New Matter, and the Statistics brought down to the Present Time. London: Burns and Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society.

The author of this work states in the Preface to the edition that is before us that he has added "one hundred and thirty pages of new matter. These embrace a number of important subjects which were either omitted, or only briefly treated, in the previous edition. Among these are: The Greek Schism; The Life and Writings of Wycliff; The Mendicant Orders; The Art of Printing, and the Bible before the Reformation; Alleged Unworthy Popes; The Culturkampf, and Catholic Organization in Germany, Belgium, and other Countries; Further Evidence of the Belief in Papal Infallibility in the Past; Some Additional Important Particulars of the Pontificate of Pius IX.; and other Interesting and useful topics, bearing on the present time." As originally put forth, the work was a very able and valuable one. The additions above mentioned have greatly enhanced its value.

The writer, throughout his whole work, has carefully endeavored to avoid uttering a word that would be painful to the feelings of non-Catholics. This is no easy task to accomplish when writing on controverted subjects, some of which, too, are subjects of hot contention; yet, the writer has been admirably successful in his endeavor, and the fact that he has been thus successful—a fact which numerous non-Catholic critics have noticed and acknowledged—makes his work all the more useful, and will secure to it, we trust, a wider circulation and reading among non-Catholics as well as Catholics.

The labor involved in the preparation of this volume must have been enormous. The materials from which it is composed are immense in number, variety, and extent, and the work of sifting, arranging, and condensing them must have been correspondingly great. In dealing with disputed points, Mr. Murphy exhibits a fairness and candor which can scarcely fail to win the admiration even of opponents. He states objections clearly, and gives to them their full measure of weight and strength, and answers them squarely and without evasion. He neither shirks nor minimizes any of the reasons that have been urged against his positions. He makes great use, too, of the writings of learned Protestants and infidels, and shows from their testimony how untenable are the opinions respecting the Papacy which are commonly entertained by those non-Catholics who are less thoroughly learned or less regardful of truth.

Another very great merit of the work is the admirable distribution which

the author makes of his material. His subject is a vast as well as an important one, embracing a multitude of topics, and comprehending a multitude of disputed questions; yet the author, by the clear and happy arrangement of his matter, separates and keeps distinctly apart various issues which, if allowed to run into each other, would confuse the reader's thoughts, and weaken the strength of the argument.

As illustrating both the author's admirable plan and arrangement of topics, and also the wide scope and comprehensiveness of his work, we enumerate the most important chapters and the subjects they treat of:

After stating concisely, but very clearly, the Scriptural proofs of the Primacy of Peter, and the testimonies of the Early Fathers, the author cites numerous all-sufficient proofs that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. After quoting numerous passages from ancient writers in proof, and giving an account of St. Peter's life and labors, as gathered from ancient tradition, he uses with great effect against Protestants who are "more zealous than learned," the declarations of Protestant writers, of high esteem among Protestants, such as Barrow, Cave, Whiston, Baratier, Pearson, etc., so that, to use the words of Whiston, the fact that St. Peter was in Rome is "so clear in Christian antiquity, that it is a shame for a Protestant to confess that any Protestant ever denied it."

Equally full and lucid is the treatment of "St. Peter's Successors in the See of Rome;" "The Relations of Popes with Councils;" "The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Holy See;" "The Greek Schism;" "The Origin of Temporal Power of the Popes, and its Growth;" "The Collapse of the Western Empire;" "The Donations of Pepin and Charlemagne," "The Diplomas of the Emperors Louis, Otho, and St. Henry;" "The Relations of the Popes and the Emperors;" and "The Vicissitudes of the Temporal Power in the Middle Ages;" all are discussed and explained with like clearness, ability, and fulness.

A distinct chapter is given to Pope St. Gregory VII., his pontificate, labors and contests, and the times in which he lived. The outcome of this chapter is a complete vindication of this holy and great Pontiff from the charges brought against him by prejudiced and superficial thinkers. The chapters on "The Temporal Power in the Twelfth Century," and in "Centuries XII. to XVIII.," are practically a continuation of the same general subject, and show, in a most lucid manner, that amid all the changes of society the temporal power of the Popes is not only necessary to the free and efficient action of the Church, but has ever been exerted for the reformation of human society, the restraint of lawlessness and tyranny, the promotion of morality, peace, and good order in society.

With like ability the author treats of the subjects of "The Great Schism of the West," of Wycliffe, of Luther, and the Great Protestant Secession, of the other leading Reformers, and of the Introduction of the Reformation into England.

Following these are interesting chapters on the Council of Trent, the Symbolic books of the Protestants, the Religious Census of Europe, the Effects of the Reformation in Protestant Countries, and the Art of Printing, and the Bible before the Reformation.

Finally, the author clinches his previous arguments, and adds to the completeness of his work, by successive chapters on the Pontificates of Pius VI., Pius VII., and Pius IX.; on Papal Infallibility, the Hierarchy, Ancient Papal Elections, Alleged Unworthy Popes, Cardinals, a Modern Papal Election, and Benefits conferred by the Papacy upon Mankind.

The last chapter is a concise statement of the attitude of the secular powers of almost every country of Europe to-day towards the Church,

and of their direct and indirect efforts to persecute and crush it. The conclusion of the whole exhibit, as expressed in the author's last sentence, is that "angry storms may rage, and the bark of Peter may be beaten and almost submerged by the winds and waves, but in it there reposes One, Who, should we tremble for its safety, may justly reprove us in the hallowed words, 'Why are you fearful, O ye of little faith.'"

THE NINE MONTHS: The Life of Our Lord in the Womb. By *Henry James Coleridge*, of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates. 1885.

This volume, though forming a part of "The Life of Our Life," by Rev. Father Coleridge, embraces a distinct and separate stage of the Incarnation. It reaches from the Annunciation to the eve of the Nativity, and comprises in its intention and scope the whole of the unborn Life of our Lord. This stage of His Life is a part of His infinite condescension, the period of His greatest humiliation and self-abasement. It is natural, therefore, that it should engage the thoughts and attract the adoring homage of devout Christians.

Moreover, this stage of our Divine Lord's human existence was the true foundation of that followed afterwards. On this account those Christians who ignore it are very generally wanting in an intelligence of the simplest truths of faith concerning the Incarnate Son of God. "The Babe of Bethlehem is like any other child to them, as He was to the people of Bethlehem itself, or as He was to the Egyptians among whom He dwelt for a time." This misconception leads to others, and extends to an inadequate idea of the whole Life, office and work of our Lord, who He is, and what He came to do.

Then, again, our Lord's Life, in itself, at this time, "reveals the work and office which He at once gave Himself to discharge towards His Father. The created existence which began at the moment of the Incarnation, was the greatest of the works of God. Holy Scripture speaks of our Lord as the Head and consummation of the whole creation. He was sent indeed on earth for the redemption of mankind, and for their instruction in the manner of serving God perfectly, but, as it is implied, His presence as Man added the crowning dignity to the creation as it was originally left. Only through Him could there be that perfect, intelligent, and worthy service to the Creator, which no one could give Him but a Divine Person. God's greatness and goodness and power and beauty and majesty required as their correlatives, so to speak, the most perfect intelligence, appreciation, gratitude, praise; and these had never been rendered to Him adequately, nor could they ever be so rendered, until the moment of the Incarnation. The Life which then began paid this homage and tribute of adoration and self-abasement, of oblation and thanksgiving. The soul of Jesus Christ was a living mirror which gave back to God the perfect representation of His glories and wonders and benefits, in an adoration of reverence, joy, and delight and gratitude which was of infinite merit and worth, because it was the homage of a Divine Person. In this consisted the gain to the glory of God which came about at the moment of the Incarnation."

This was the occupation and Life of our Lord during these nine months, when He did not begin as yet to redeem, or to atone, or to teach, in the ordinary way, as He did afterwards, but when He began from the very first moment to devote Himself to honoring and glorifying His Father by the most intense acts of love and adoration.

From all this we may also gather that "at the first moment of this

adorable Life was made the great oblation of Himself, of which the Scripture speaks, to undergo all that had been decreed for Him to suffer in order to repair the sins of all the world before the majesty of God. But the occupation of the Sacred Heart during these long months, an occupation never since intermitted, and never to cease for all eternity, was the employment of all His faculties of intelligence and affection upon the greatness and loveliness and majesty of God."

These nine months in the Womb of the Ever Blessed Virgin Mary are the time in our Lord's Life which seems most entirely given up to this employment. God was all in all. "Out of this Life in the womb, which had no external manifestation at all, there sprang all the beauties and charities of the after stages of the Holy Infancy, the Childhood, the Hidden Life at Nazareth, the Public Ministry, the Passion, the Risen and Sacramental and Glorious Life. It is this Life which continues now in Heaven where He sits at the right hand of God, and in order that earth may not be without this continual and most perfect worship, He remains among us on the altar not only to be the food and consolation of the devout souls who receive Him and live by Him, but also that from Him may rise up, day after day and night after night, as long as the world lasts, His own most loving adoration, most powerful intercession, and most intelligent praise."

These considerations, which we have partly stated in the words of Father Coleridge, but with much less fulness and clearness than he has expressed them, have caused him to prepare the volume before us. There was also another consideration in his mind. It was this: That "another and momentous fruit of an intelligent devotion to this part of the Sacred Infancy is to be found in the light which it throws on the position of the Blessed Mother of our Lord in the Kingdom of her Divine Son, His dependence on her and union with her in the natural order, the universality of her graces, and the supreme perfection of her virtues."

The comprehensiveness and also the particularity of Father Coleridge's treatment of his all-important and momentous subject, may be inferred from the heads under which he considers it. His work is divided into fourteen chapters, which respectively treat of The Salutation of the Angel, The Trouble of Mary, The Son of David, "How Shall This Be Done?" The Conception by the Holy Ghost, The Fiat of Mary, Our Lord's Life in the Womb, The Visitation, The Canticle of Mary, The Nativity of St. John, The Canticle of Zachary, The Opening of St. Matthew's Gospel and his object as different from that of St. Luke, and also God's dealing with St. Joseph; The Trial of St. Joseph, The Expectation of our Lord's Nativity. Following the author's reflections on these subjects is a Harmony of the Gospels respecting them, and following this is an Appendix containing Heads of Meditation on the Life of our Lord in the Womb.

To those who are at all acquainted with Father Coleridge's writings on the Gospels and the Life of our Blessed Redeemer, it is needless to say that this volume is the fruit of careful and laborious research into and collation of all that has previously been written on the subject by the most approved theologians of the Church, and also of prayerful and devout study and meditation on the part of the author himself. It is a work which cannot fail, if read with a devout spirit (and with no other spirit can this profound mystery be approached without sacrifice), to increase the reverence and arouse the adoration of the reader for our Divine Lord, as well as enlighten his mind as to the profound, the unfathomable mystery, yet at the same time the glorious revelation of truths, which are comprised in the Incarnation.

ELEMENTS OF PHILOSOPHY, COMPRISING LOGIC AND ONTOLOGY, OR GENERAL METAPHYSICS. By *Rev. Walter H. Hill, S. J.*, Professor of Philosophy in the St. Louis University. Seventh Revised Edition. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. London: Washbourne, 18 Paternoster Row.

Father Hill's book is so well known that an extended notice of it is unnecessary. When it is remembered that speculative and abstract subjects, which belong essentially to higher learning, are not the ones that the majority of men have either the time or the inclination to pursue, and that, notwithstanding this fact, the present work has, in a short time, reached its seventh edition, it is abundant evidence of a purpose happily conceived and brilliantly accomplished. The signal success which has attended this excellent educational treatise is owing to the intrinsic merit of the book; for it compendiously reproduces the system of logic and the leading metaphysical topics proposed and established by the old masters of thought. Contributing, also, to this success was the real want which existed for just such a text-book in our language. The author of the "Elements of Philosophy" was peculiarly well-fitted for the work he undertook, as his special occupation for the last thirty years has been the study and teaching of philosophy. In this employment his method is as felicitous as it is comprehensive and effectual; to pursue every discussion until it rests upon those clear and immutable first principles which are the basis of all reasoning and inquiry. Indeed, a subject can be known adequately and comprehensively only then, when it is surveyed in the light of its absolutely first and unchangeable principles; these effectually satisfy the intellect of man in its quest for truth, for they leave open no ulterior question, no possibility of error or deception.

Father Hill is a Jesuit, a fact which, of itself, guarantees the thoroughness of his book. He has not written to defend any pet theory of philosophy, nor is he attached to any philosophical system in a mere party spirit, but he has mastered and presented to the English-speaking public the great and catholic truths of human reason, which guided aright the speculations of Aristotle, and enabled St. Thomas to become the prince of Christian philosophers. One of these time-honored truths of metaphysics the author thus states: "The uncreated essence of God is the commensurate or adequate object of the divine intellect; spiritual or angelic essence, *i.e.*, created immaterial essence, is the proportioned object of angelic intellect; the essence of the human soul is the connatural and proportioned object of the cognoscive soul when existing separated from the body" (p. 104).

This is the universal teaching of the Christian schools enlightened by the wisdom of Aristotle.¹ It is not, however, explicitly affirmed in the words just cited that the disembodied spirit of man can actually elicit an act of intellection by its own unassisted natural power, although it is, perhaps, a just inference from the writer's doctrine. For, if the connatural and proportioned object of the separated intellectual soul is

¹ "[Deus] . . . honorabilissimum intelligit, . . .

Seipsum ergo intelligit."—*Arist. 12, Met. T. C., 50.*

"Ipse solus [Deus] seipsum perfecte comprehendit actu infinito et adaequato ipsi objecto quod est ipsa sua propria essentia."—*Scotus, Ibid., T. C., 39.*

"The adequate object of God's intellect is what is most excellent. . . .

"It is, therefore, Himself.

"He, alone, perfectly comprehends Himself by an infinitely intelligent act, commensurate with its object, which is His own essence."

the essence of the soul itself, it should seem to follow that, to elicit an act of intellection, *i.e.*, actually to understand and to know, is naturally possible to the unembodied spirit. This, however, is not held by several authors, who argue that the absence of imagination renders actual intellection naturally impossible, and, by consequence, that the separated soul requires and receives supplementary infused ideas which enable it actually to understand.

This opinion is resisted by others, who conceive it as debasing the rational nature of man to take from it all power of eliciting its connatural and proportioned operation. They argue that thus to deprive the soul of the real faculty of completely forming ideas and knowing, is to reduce it in rank below inferior beings, all of which are perfectly fitted by nature for their respective essential operations. Hence, they conclude that the soul, being a complete substance, can, in its bodiless state, know the objects that it formerly knew, *i.e.*, can intellectually remember them; that it can, moreover, in a manner proper to its new condition of existence, but without supernatural aid, acquire the knowledge of objects that are unknown, if such objects are proportioned to it, and *objected* before it, within the sphere of its own natural light.¹ It can, accordingly, increase its knowledge by the acquisition of new and objectively real conceptions. The soul can also know itself then by a simple total and continuous self-presence, according to which it is entirely *objected* before itself, and completely visible even independently of any idea representing itself, and when no idea of any object is actually informing the intellect. Although this species of knowledge belongs to the disembodied soul as having a spiritual nature, yet it is not the distinctly rational operation by which the intellect knows objects; nor can it thus know any other object less intimate than self; and even its own substantial being, immediately and perfectly so beheld, will doubtless not be adequately comprehended. The completely rational mode of knowing *self*, or any other object, is by way of a mental *word*, or idea, actually informing the intellect and empowering it intrinsically to speak and understand its object. The word, or conception of the understanding, will then, also, express the intelligible essence of an object, its "quiddity," since the change of state which the soul undergoes will affect its cognoscive action only in relation to what is extrinsic to the cognitive faculty, and not as to what is intrinsic and essential to the act of knowing.

It would exceed the space at our disposal to discuss this subject fully. For further information upon this and other salient principles of metaphysics, the reader is referred to Father Hill's book. If the matter contained in this judicious philosophical manual is well fixed in the mind, and understood, the student of philosophy is put in possession of metaphysical truths that are the real safeguard against prevalent errors.

¹ "Nihil est in phantasmate propter quod sufficiat ad causandam speciem intelligibilem quin eminentius sit in re cuius est phantasma."—*Scotus Dist.*, 4, 45, 2.

"Species intelligibilis eodem modo potest informare intellectum separatum sicut conjunctum."—*Ibid.*

"For concurring extrinsically in the production of an intellectual idea there is, in the fancy's representative likeness of an object, nothing that is not more eminently in the object itself which such likeness reproduces."

"An intellectual concept can inform the intellect, and perfect it for knowing, as well when the soul is separated from, as when united to the body."

THE WORKS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON: Collected and Arranged by *Henry F. Brownson*. Vol. XIX., Containing the Writings on Literature. Detroit: Thorndike Nourse, Publisher. 1885.

This last volume of Brownson's "*Collected Works*" is made up of thirty essays on different subjects connected with literature, chiefly American literature. The field of thought the author ranges over is a wide one, but he makes no random excursions through it. Whether he touches on religion, morals, politics, history, national characteristics, or other topics, his disquisitions always have a distinct purpose and an evident and direct relation to the subject under consideration. Some few of the papers in this volume were written and published before Dr. Brownson became a Catholic, but even they contain indications of the direction in which he was moving, and of the goal he subsequently reached. All the rest of them were produced since his conversion, and examine and discuss their respective subjects from a Catholic point of view.

An idea, though necessarily an imperfect one, can be formed of the scope of the volume from an enumeration of the titles of the most important papers it contains. There are three on American Literature; one on Carlyle's French Revolution; on Modern French Literature; The Scholar's Mission; Modern Idolatry; Schiller's *Æsthetic Theory*; Religious Novels; R. W. Emerson's Poems; Novel Writing and Novel Reading; Popular Literature; The Catholic Press; Catholic Secular Literature; The Vision of Sir Launfal (as misinterpreted by J. R. Lowell in his poem on the subject); Dana's Poems and Prose Writings; The Works of Daniel Webster; Bancroft's History of the United States; Wordsworth's Poetical Works; Liberal Studies; Catholicity and Literature; *Etudes de Théologie*; Literature, Love, and Marriage; Use and Abuse of Reading; Beecher's Norwood; Religious Novels and Woman *Versus* Woman; Catholic Popular Literature; Women's Novels.

Nor are the papers on the topics superficial and discursive essays. They are careful, keenly analytical, and thorough studies of their respective subjects, replete with the fruits of extensive learning, mature reflection, and profound reasoning. We know of no disquisitions in the English language on the subjects which these papers treat of that are more discriminating, more thoughtful, more exhaustive.

It has recently been said that if Dr. Brownson had written in more polished and cultured style and with more sweetness of temper, he would have exercised much greater influence. We are of an entirely opposite opinion. As regards style, Brownson's writings are models of pure, limpid, vigorous English. His style is beautiful in its simplicity and its transparent clearness. It is admirably suited, too, to the nature of the subjects discussed and the manner in which they are treated. As regards sweetness of temper, Brownson is never ill-humored, and in his most earnest discussions and vigorous controversies Brownson was the soul of honor and honesty. The petty tricks of logical fence he understood thoroughly and just as thoroughly he despised them, never condescending to employ them. He was straightforward, candid, conceding to his opponents every point and position which truth demanded, and just as stubbornly refusing to concede that which would have compromised the truth. As for meretricious rhetorical ornaments, they would have been utterly out of place in his writings, and would have weakened instead of strengthened his arguments.

And just these characteristics of Brownson's style and method of reasoning secured him an "audience," a clientage of readers, while he lived

and wrote, not only in this country, but wherever the English language is spoken, select it may be, but more thoughtful and more earnest than any other English writer of his age; and now that he has passed away from earth, they give to his writings a permanent value which the productions of very few other authors possess.

It is a great mistake to think that persons who are thoroughly in earnest, though of opposite opinions, will be placated in their opposition by complimentary phrases or by half concealing an unpleasant truth with flowers of rhetoric. Honest opponents (and none others are worthy of consideration) are pleased rather than offended by the exhibition of straightforward honesty on the part of those whom they are opposing. As in days of chivalry a knight had all the higher respect for the knight arrayed against him, whether in the peaceful tournament or in a conflict for life and death, who with spear or sword or battle-axe did his best; as to-day the true soldier regards all the more highly those of his foes who fight most valiantly; so those who are earnest and honest (though in error) esteem all the more warmly and will read and consider all the more appreciatively the arguments of opponents who meet them honestly and fairly, who call things by their plain names, and state their positions and put their arguments frankly and strenuously, without minimizing, and yet without malice. In the words of Sir Walter Scott describing William of Deloraine,

They "ne'er bore grudge for stalwart blow,
Given in fair fight with gallant foe."

Orestes A. Brownson was a man for his age and for his country. He wrote for his age and country (for he was intensely an American), and for men of his age and country who were able and willing to think. That was his special work, the work which "his hand found to do." And well did he do that work. And now that he is dead do his works still live and flourish, and long will continue so to do, we warmly and sincerely trust and believe.

LIFE OF ST. PHILIP BENIZI, OF THE ORDER OF THE SERVANTS OF MARY (1223-1285). With Some Account of the First Disciples of the Saint. By the *Rev. Peregrine Saulier*, Priest of the same Order. Translated from the French, and Revised by the same Author. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. 1886.

The fact of the year 1885 being the sixth Centennary of the holy death of St. Philip Benizi, suggested to the Right Rev. Father-General of the Order of Servants of Mary, that the occasion was a fitting one for preparing and publishing a new Life of that eminent Saint, for those which had been previously published were out of print, and, moreover, were written in a style that was little suited to the taste of the present age. Accordingly, he requested Rev. Father Saulier to prepare such a Life, and the volume before us is the fruit of his compliance with the request of his Superior.

In the preparation of his work, the Rev. author availed himself (as we learn from his modest and self-deprecatory preface) of all accessible sources of reliable information. In this he was greatly aided by the Right Rev. General of the Order, and several of the members. He consulted not only the former Lives of the Saint that are still extant, but also the original documents upon which they were based, and the references to such documents in other authentic writings where the documents themselves have been destroyed. Of the extent of this destruction the Rev. author, among other instances, refers to the Convent of Sienna, in

which more than eleven thousand precious manuscripts were destroyed in an incendiary fire kindled by some ruthless soldiers. The Rev. author was also furnished by the Very Rev. General of the Order with the Processes of Canonization of the holy Saint Philip Benizi, drawn up at Florence, in 1619, and at Todi, in 1620. These two documents contain authentic information as to the actions and virtues of the Saint, as well as of his miracles, and are of inestimable historical value. From these, from the annals of the Order, and from other authentic sources of information, the work before us has been prepared.

The Order of the Servants of Mary is but little known in this country. It may be well, therefore, to say that, like all the Religious Orders of the Church, it had its origin in the pious desire and resolve of its founders to follow the Evangelical counsels, and live with greater detachment from the world than is ordinarily possible to those who continue amid the distractions of secular life. Like the other Religious Orders, too, it had certain specific purposes and objects to promote. In the Order of the Servants of Mary, these were special love, devotion, and reverence for the Ever Blessed Virgin Mary, the Holy Mother of God.

The Order was founded in the early part of the thirteenth century by seven rich merchants of Florence, who renounced all their worldly possessions, and retiring to Monte Senario, near Florence, lived there in poverty. They possessed no individual property, and practiced great austerities. Their first Superior was the Blessed Bonfilio Monaldi, one of the original founders of the Order. At first, it grew slowly; but after St. Philip Benizi was received into it, in 1254, first as a lay brother (concealing his distinguished intellectual gifts and his learning), and in the course of a few years ordained to the Priesthood, and soon afterwards raised to the office of General, the Order increased rapidly and spread beyond Italy into France, Flanders, Friesland, Saxony, and other parts of Germany.

St. Philip died on the Octave of the Feast of the Assumption. He was canonized by Clement X., in 1671. But Clement X. died before the publication of the bull of canonization, and it was not published until 1724, by Benedict XIII.

The work before us gives a clear and interesting account of the life and labors of this eminent Servant of Mary, of his innocent and virtuous life from his youth onwards, his unaffected and profound humility, his temptations and interior conflicts and the manner in which he triumphed over them; his avoidance of all ecclesiastical dignities (among which was his probable elevation to the Papal chair); his missions into foreign countries; his zeal and devotion; of the miracles he performed whilst living, and of others that were wrought after his death through invoking his intercession. It also contains succinct sketches of the lives of the seven Blessed Founders of the Order, and of its progress and condition in France and Germany.

THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE; BEING THE STORY OF THE FOURTH CRUSADE.
By Edwin Pears, LL.B. New York: Harper & Bros. 1885.

The way of the special pleader is hard, almost as hard, indeed, as that of the transgressor; and justly so, for he is most frequently a transgressor himself. Mr. Pears, who announces himself on the title-page of his book as a "barrister-at-law, late president of the European bar at Constantinople, and Knight of the Greek Order of the Saviour," is nothing if not a special pleader, and a very aggravated type of the species he is, too. Seized with a "holy horror" of the "unspeakable

Turk," against whom he is as severe as the most enthusiastic Gladstonian dare be, he has undertaken the hopeless task of rehabilitating the Greek Empire of the Middle Ages. Except in this respect his book is in no way remarkable, though he evidently has read a great deal of the literature of his subject, than which, he truly says, "no other historical question has had devoted to it" "during the last twenty-five years," "the labors of an equal number of illustrious historical students." If he intends to class himself among these, he ranks entirely too high in his own estimation; for he has done nothing to settle the literary controversy which "has been waged, and is still waging, about several of the important questions which have arisen in connection with the subject."

The purely narrative part of his work is pretty creditably done, but not at all so well as is the same story by Gibbon, Finlay, Michaud, and some other writers not so well known as these. It is when he attempts to elucidate the philosophy of history that he shows his weakness—here, indeed, he fails utterly. Two of the main points which he attempts to make are, that politically and morally the Eastern Empire was strong enough to permanently make successful resistance against Moslem aggression, and that the Latin Conquest of Constantinople in 1204 was the direct cause of that city's falling into the power of the Turks in 1453. As to the former, a sufficient refutation is contained in Mr. Pears' own pages. The Greeks of that time he shows to be corrupt, treacherous and fickle. Intrigues against the throne, and the violent substitution of one ruler for another were as common as in the worst days of the old Roman Empire, when the wearer of the imperial purple was the creature of the soldiery, and political morality was at its lowest ebb. If there be any valid reason for the second contention, why had so many rich provinces formerly under Greek dominion fallen into the hands of the Mohammedans? And why were the Greeks barely able to withstand the attacks of a mere handful of the invading followers of Islam, whilst the Crusaders were struggling with the great body of the common enemy in other directions?

We may all admit that the deflection of the Fourth Crusade from its original destination to the attack on Constantinople was a most deplorable mishap, a flagrant and entirely reprehensible crime if it was the result of a bargain with the enemies of the Christian name. But the Greeks had given ample cause for bitter feeling against themselves on the part of the Latins. More than once they had acted treacherously towards the Crusaders of the earlier expeditions, and allowed disaster to overtake them when by honest coöperation both could have inflicted blows on the Turks from which they would not easily recover. The Grecian jealousy of the western invaders brought ruin upon both; but the carrying of the war into Asia Minor and Palestine by the Latins delayed the establishment of Mohammedan power at Constantinople and possibly prevented the subjection of the whole of Europe to it. The ease with which the city was taken by the Latins showed its utter weakness, and indicated what the result would be were a commander like Saladin to appear before it with his mighty hosts, for whom its western conquerors were no more than a match. Fruitless, unfortunate and criminal, then, as was the Fourth Crusade, its effect was not what Mr. Pears wants to make it appear. So utterly does he fail to establish his thesis that some friend might properly suggest to him the propriety of studying a treatise on logic before attempting another essay in the philosophy of history. Then by careful study he might be able to ascertain that the new Rome fell as the old had done, as much from its own corruption as from the shocks of attacking hordes of invaders.

THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM, OR THE UNFAILING PROMISE. By the *Rev. James J. Moriarty, L.L.D.*, Pastor of St. John the Evangelist's Church, Syracuse, New York, and author of "Stumbling Blocks made Stepping Stones on the Road to the Catholic Faith," etc. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company; London: Burns & Oates.

The motive thought in the author's mind for writing this book seems to have been suggested, as we infer from the introductory chapter, by a perusal of Mallock's work on the question, "Is Life Worth Living?" Rev. Dr. Moriarty argues, and correctly argues, that, "if life be really worth living, it is only because of religion, the key it affords to the mysteries of life, the motives of action which it furnishes, the innumerable aids it supplies, the consolations it gives, and the well-grounded hopes it holds out of a brighter, undying life in the future."

Taking this as an accepted conclusion, and using it as a starting point, the author presses the questions, and answers them, severally, in successive chapters: "Is Religion Worthy of Man's Study?" "If so, What Religion?" "By Whom was the True Religion Founded?" "What Rule of Faith was Laid Down?" "What Marks, Notes, and Characteristics Distinguish the True Church from All Others?"

The spirit in which the author writes will be sufficiently shown by the following statement, which we give in his own language: "In treating of the characteristics of the Catholic faith, we shall necessarily have to refer to opposing systems of religion, and to their manifest lack of these shining qualities, by which Christ wished His to be forever distinguished. Truth is not always agreeable; yet, for the sake of immortal souls that are perishing for want of the light, and are living in 'the darkness of the shadow of death,' it should be told plainly, yet kindly. Hence, in whatever we have written in this book, it is certainly not our intention to offend; and, when we have had something to say that might appear harsh to those not of the household of faith, we have endeavored to select the opinions of non-Catholic writers, and let those speak who cannot be accused of any partiality towards our Holy Mother, the Church."

This statement (and in it we recognize the prevailing spirit of Catholic writers, even on subjects fiercely controverted by opponents of the true faith) shows at once the prudence and the charity of the writer.

Whatever excuse or reason there may have been in past times for violent denunciation of Protestants because of their frequently malicious assaults upon Catholics, and their glowing misrepresentations of the doctrines and history of the Catholic Church, the need and use for that kind of controversy has almost entirely, if not entirely, passed away. Protestants, generally, are still prejudiced, it is true, against the Catholic religion, and many of them are still bigoted. But their prejudices and bigotry now are not, at least not so much as in times past, the result of malice and self-will, as of the influence and effect of their wrong education and the power exerted upon them (unconsciously to themselves, it is to be hoped), of the false and delusive Protestant traditions, amidst which they have grown and by which their thoughts and sentiments have been shaped and moulded. Kindness, gentleness, forbearance and charity, therefore, are more potent instrumentalities in leading them to a knowledge of their errors, than heated argument, or the expression of indignation, however just and well-grounded that indignation might be.

With these preliminary remarks upon the general spirit of the work before us, we pass on to a consideration of its contents. After answering affirmatively, in the first chapter, the question, "Is Religion Worthy of Man's Study," the writer considers the question, "What Rule of

Faith Was Laid Down by Christ?" The treatment of this all-important subject is highly satisfactory. It is simple, direct, and clear.

The subsequent chapters of the work are occupied with proving that the Church of Christ is One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic.

A LITERARY AND BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL HISTORY, OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS. From the Breach with Rome, in 1534, to the Present Time. By *Joseph Gillow*. Volume II. London: Burns & Oates; New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company.

The first volume of this work we noticed favorably in the REVIEW for October, 1885. Its object, as defined by the author, is to "present, in most ready and convenient form, a concise record of the literary efforts, educational struggles, and the sufferings for religion's sake of the Catholics in England down to the present time, from that of Henry VIII.'s breach with Rome."

The history of Catholicity in England during this period, and of the sufferings which English Catholics had to endure, is only beginning to be known. What has heretofore been written on the subject, has, mainly, consisted of special treatises, bringing out particular phases of it, or confined to certain localities in England. And even these works have, owing to various circumstances, had a very limited circulation. Of late years, however, a praiseworthy activity has been displayed by English Catholic writers in this important field of literary labor. The work before us, of which the first two volumes have been published, when completed (as the author intends it to be in five volumes), will be a very valuable addition to what has been already accomplished. It is a compilation from the labors of previous writers, original documents, catalogues of public and private libraries, booksellers' and sale catalogues, with information derived also from personal sources. It consists of bibliographical and biographical notices, with criticisms, "of all deceased Catholic authors, martyrs, confessors of the faith, cardinals, bishops, vicars apostolic," etc., artists, including "painters, sculptors, architects, musicians, and actors," and, in like manner, "members of the legal, medical, military, naval and scientific professions, who have risen to eminence, in spite of legislative restriction, and of an intolerant public spirit, which sought to prohibit Catholics from enjoying the position to which their merits would otherwise have entitled them, also find a place in the work." To give additional value to the contents, "the authorities, from which the biographies are chiefly drawn, are carefully noted."

The first volume comprises, according to the alphabetical arrangement the author adopts, the biographical notices of Catholics from A to C, both inclusive. The second volume continues the work to Grad.

STORIES OF DUTY. A BOOK FOR BOYS AND GIRLS. By *Maurice Francis Egan*, author of "Life Around Us," "The Theatre and Christian Parents," etc. Philadelphia: Fasy, Comber & Co., 106 South Thirteenth Street. 1885.

This is a volume of pleasant yet thoughtful stories, which, we are sure, boys and girls will be delighted to read. The scenes and incidents all belong to life in our own country. On this account they are not the less interesting, and also will be all the more suggestive and profitable. We need *American* Catholic literature, particularly for children, and are glad to see that Mr. Egan recognizes this want and is laboring to do his part to supply it. We heartily commend this work as a suitable present from parents to children.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—APRIL, 1886.—No. 42.

THE ROMAN QUESTION.

MORE than once, since a recent visit to Italy, we have been asked our opinion of the condition of things in that country, and if what we had seen then had given us any hope of an early restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. The questions and the answers we had to give suggested the subject of the present article. In what we have to say we shall draw far less on personal observation than on our reading, and on conversations had with persons better acquainted with Italy than we can pretend to be.

Like all persons who had known Rome before 1870, and who have visited it since that time, we found it much improved, materially. The streets were cleaner than they used to be. New hotels, blocks, and even streets of private residences, in the style of the new Paris boulevards, and large public buildings, had arisen in all directions. Nowhere in Europe had we seen as many soldiers, and especially officers, out of quarters. The streets were filled with them. But though to our unprofessional eye their uniforms were all that could be desired, the men contrasted sadly with the soldierly police, dragoons, and Noble Guard of former days. There was something about them that recalled an anecdote we had heard of the grandfather of the late King of Naples. He had been present at a review of his troops, at which they appeared for the first time in a new uniform. At the close of the manœuvres he

was asked by the general in command what he thought of the men. "You may dress them as you please," replied his majesty; "they will run away."

Many property owners in Rome had, we were told, become pretty well reconciled to the new order of things. The reason of this was that since it had become the capital, real estate had increased threefold in value. The government had brought with it fifty thousand officials and about as many workmen, and these needed house accommodations, and put money in circulation. This was a serious temptation, even to a people as loyal as the Romans had ever been to the Popes, and it is not to be wondered at that some of them should have yielded to it, to the extent of trying to carry water on both shoulders.

The people, in outward bearing at least, seemed as decorous and grave as ever. The churches were as well attended, the smaller ones as crowded with devout worshippers as of old time. Two things only seemed to point to the growth of modern ideas in the Eternal City, the profanation of the Sunday in many places, and an evident falling off in the moral training of the young. Roman boys, even those of tender years, once so modest, can now smoke cigars and swear in the streets with as much ease and self-composure as those of any other city in Europe or America. This was all of evil that was seen on the streets. We were told, however, that in the theatres, and in too many other places, things were done the like of which had not been known in Rome since pagan times. But as nothing of the sort came under our personal observation, we prefer to pass such matters over in silence.

Business was very dull in Rome last May. It always is at that season. But store-keepers told us that even during the previous winter they had done little or nothing. Hotel-keepers had the same complaint to make. Both agreed that as many visitors had come as in previous years, but that they had remained only a short time and spent little. Everybody complained of the taxes, which amounted to over forty per cent. of every man's income or profits. An American physician, who had settled in Rome some years ago, told us he had attempted to practise his profession there last year, but finding that the tax on the profession exceeded any receipts he could reasonably hope for from it, he closed his office.

And, in point of fact, the whole country is overwhelmed by taxation. "There is nothing left us to tax but the air we breathe," said Senator Iacini, Chairman of the Committee of Agricultural Affairs in 1880. "Rural Italy," said this same gentleman last May, "has to bear an accumulation of taxes greater than that of any other nation in the world. We have in this touched the limits of the absurd." One-fourth of the income from land goes in direct

taxes; one-half the remainder goes to those who till it on shares, or a third to those who till it at the expense of the owner. The rest is all, or nearly all, spent in paying personal or other taxes, of which there are some forty-six in Italy. So that Italians nowadays may be said to till the soil for the national, provincial and municipal treasuries. The *Unita Cattolica* of the 27th of last January informs us that the public debt of all the Italian States, before 1860, was about seven hundred and twenty-two millions of francs, and that it is now, under United Italy, eighteen milliards, eight hundred and eighty-two millions! On this is paid a yearly interest of about five hundred millions. The result of all this has been that tens of thousands of holdings have been sold every year for taxes. The *Gazzetta Ufficiale* of April 28th, 1885, puts the number for each year at thirty-four thousand. The occupants of those holdings have been compelled to emigrate, or go to swell the ever-increasing numbers of the dangerous classes. The confiscated church property, valued at two milliards of francs, has nearly all disappeared. One-half of it had been sold as early as 1870. On the fourth of July of that year, Deputy Bartolucci asked the Parliament if the money thus acquired had made them any richer, and if in that instance, too, the old proverb had not been verified, that "the devil's flour turns all to waste"? and added, on the authority of the Minister of Finance, that there remained of it then "only a black spot."

The prison reports of the Italian kingdom show that of late years it has attained a sad primacy in crime among civilized nations. Want and misery are everywhere on the increase; and even in Rome itself, the place most favored by the patronage and prestige of the government, the poor sometimes faint and die in the streets for hunger. Such a thing had never been heard of under the Popes.

There was no city in the world where the poor were as well cared for as in Rome before the advent of its present rulers. From time immemorial every Pope had his almoner residing near him in his palace, whose duty it was to help the needy poor. "There was not in Rome," says Morichini, "a religious association or institution that did not dispense relief, not a convent, or a monastery, that did not give some kind of food, not a noble or wealthy house that had not its fixed assignment for the poor." "It certainly does appear to be a matter next to an impossibility," says John Francis Maguire, in his book on "Rome, its Ruler and its Institutions," "that one should die of starvation in Rome; for not only are the most ample resources applicable to every human want, and to which the poor may have immediate access, to be found there, but there exist all kinds of charitable associations, directed to the

sacred duty of feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, and comforting the afflicted. Then there are many well-known public institutions always open to the poor person in distress, and from whose doors want and destitution are never driven by surly porters, representing rather the selfishness of the rate-payer than the charity of the Christian."

Nor was this lavish charity allowed to encourage mere vagrancy, for, as Mr. Maguire remarks, "the most rigorous measures have been adopted by successive Popes, from the time of Pius V., in the sixteenth century, to Pius IX., in the nineteenth, to suppress vagrancy and punish imposture." There were also in Rome various societies, whose object it was to seek out the poor who were ashamed to beg, and give them needed assistance, such as the Arch-Confraternity of the Twelve Apostles, the Urbana Congregation, and the Congregation of Divine Mercy. "The first mentioned," says Mr. Maguire, "employs a number of physicians who visit the sick whom the members have found to stand in need of such succour. They also provide professional assistance for the defence of the poor, and they specially protect orphans and widows, and procure a safe shelter for girls in danger. They likewise arrange disputes and reconcile enemies. The Brothers, who are called 'Deputies,' are all of noble or wealthy families." There was also in Rome a society to give employment to the poor, and especially to the aged poor, on the public works, and one of lawyers and persons attached to the *Curia*, called the Society of St. Ivo, to defend them gratis in the courts.

There were asylums for all the orphans of both sexes in the city, where they were educated and taught trades, and from some of which the girls, after they had left and were about to marry, received a modest dower to enable them to go to housekeeping. There were in Rome no less than fourteen establishments of this description. In one of them, St. Michael's, there were, besides a number of old men and old women, about five hundred boys and girls. The boys were taught all trades, and when they displayed particular talent they were instructed by the best masters in music, painting, sculpture, architecture, and all other branches of the liberal arts. The first time we heard Italian opera was at this institution, and those present declared they had never heard it given with better effect than by the fresh young voices they then listened to. The leading tenor on the occasion soon afterwards acquired a European reputation.

Then in Rome, under the Popes, hospitals were so numerous and so well appointed that their accommodation could never be overtaxed. They had special wards, and even special buildings, set apart for different diseases, from the ordinary indisposition to

the malady that is incurable. And there were even institutions to receive convalescents who had left the hospitals, and keep them till their strength was sufficiently restored to enable them to resume their ordinary avocations.

Such was the charity of Rome under the Popes—a charity that taught men to see in the poor and the sick our Lord himself, and to think that what was done to them was done unto Him.

The Piedmontese seized all the institutions founded by this charity in the lapse of ages, and put them under almost exclusively secular management. The result has been that disorder, and more serious abuses than mere disorder, have crept into most of them; their revenues have been wasted by incompetent and dishonest officials, and the poor and the sick and the orphan have been left to suffer. One lamentable instance of this was brought to light last summer. The richest and the largest hospital in Rome was that of *Santo Spirito*. It was founded by Ina, king of the Saxons, about the year 728. It is located in the Leonine city, or *Borgo*, not far from the Vatican palace. The Popes, and especially Pius IX., expended vast sums in enlarging and adorning it, and providing it with all the best appliances which science had introduced for institutions of the kind. In 1870 it had 1680 beds, though the average number of patients was only from six to seven hundred. Its annual revenue was 1,138,678 francs. Of this, 759,539 francs went for the support of the sick and the foundlings of an asylum that was attached to it. Last June Augustus Silvestrelli was appointed director of this institution; but, before definitely accepting the position, he prudently resolved to look into its financial condition. He did so, and in his report to the Hospital Commission of Rome, on the 20th of June, he informed that body that the annual revenue has been reduced from 1,138,678 to 64,018 francs. "This amount," he says, "is not sufficient to maintain even the conservatory, and nothing is left for the foundlings, or for the support of a single patient in the hospital!" "This immense deficit," he adds, "was at first concealed by the seeming regularity of the accounts, but was finally discovered; and now the true condition of things should be made known to everybody." And thus fifteen years of revolutionary rule sufficed to destroy what it took the Popes centuries to accumulate for the unfortunate in their capital. Some, even, of the radical journals, commenting on this fact, intimated that the same condition of things would be found to exist in only too many of the charitable institutions of the kingdom.

But, even apart from "irregularities" of this sort, the constant drain on charitable institutions, in the form of taxes and expenses of administration, is frightful. In 1878 the assets of these institu-

tions, in all Italy, amounted to 1,626,662,962 francs, with a net annual income of 90,859,521 francs. Of this income, the government took 14,484,332 francs in taxes; 15,062,455 were spent on administration; 14,202,510 went to meet other expenses; so that there remained for the poor but 47,110,223 francs, or only a little more than one-half the income! In view of these facts and figures, it is not to be wondered at that Deputy Sanguinetti should have said in Parliament, March 8th, 1881, that charity in Italy was then organized theft.

The last statement we have seen of the actual condition of things, in the unhappy country, was made by Deputy Romano, in the Parliament, on the 12th December, 1885: "What," he asked, "are the effects of this iliad of sorrows? They are general distress and misery, with the exception of a few colossal old fortunes, and some new ones, that are the fruit of public wrong; a general struggle for existence, by one class of society, which detests the other, believing it to be the cause of its misfortunes, though the true cause is bad government; all the consequences of ill-advising, hunger (*male-sua da fames*), deterioration of character and immorality, the mania of place-hunting, the emigration of those who do not wish to be obliged to choose between a wretched occupation and crime; smuggling, usury, crimes and suicides, and an increasing discontent that is undermining our institutions and the tranquillity of the state."

And now, as to the temporal power of the Pope. We really do not see any human grounds of hope for its speedy restoration. The Revolution went to Rome, not so much to find a historic or a convenient capital for United Italy, as to destroy the Papacy. One of its most prominent leaders said, on the 26th of March, 1861: "Not by excessive devotion, not by theological teaching, but by the ideas proclaimed by the French Revolution, can we succeed in the so-called Roman question." "These ideas," he added, "are those of the encyclopædists, of Rousseau, of Voltaire, of the free-thinkers, and they can redeem us from the Pontiff." And the radical organ, the *Diritto*, of July 3d, 1863, scouted the illogical and hypocritical promise to respect the spiritual authority of the Pope, after having abolished his temporal power. "Our revolution," it said, August 11th, of the same year, "aims at the destruction of the Catholic Church; it must destroy it; it cannot fail to destroy it. Nationality, unity, political liberty, are means to this end, the total destruction of Catholicity, which it (the Revolution) has much at heart." Other journals, and other distinguished revolutionists, have, time and again, given expression to the same sentiments. In 1870, just before the entrance of the Piedmontese into Rome, Mazzini wrote: "The energies of the party must now be

concentrated on Rome, so as to make it impossible for the Papacy to live within its walls." It would be idle, then, to hope that a government that is the creature of the Revolution, and, just now, controlled by its radical Left, will, of its own accord, ever abandon Rome to the Pope. Its adherents have repeatedly declared that, rather than do so, they are prepared to reduce it to a heap of ruins. And this, we are persuaded, was no empty threat.

On the other hand, it is not to be expected that the people of Italy will be able to change or materially modify the present state of things in that country. "The whole electoral body," wrote Cardinal Manning, in 1877, "does not exceed half a million of men. In twenty-six millions there is not so much as a fiftieth part who possess the electoral franchise. . . . Of those five hundred thousand men, two hundred and fifty thousand, that is, one-half, never go to the polls, or record a vote. They are Catholics who, for conscience sake, have from the beginning refrained from voting. They have never voted at all, and that upon these grounds: that if they were to vote, they would recognize the law, they would accept the constitution, they would be partakers in the present state of Rome, and sanction its usurpation. Moreover, any man whom they might elect could not sit in the Chamber without taking the oath that binds him to the Revolution that now holds Italy down, and to the violation of the sovereignty of the Head of the Church. . . . Those two hundred and fifty thousand men are but half of the electoral body, and less than one-hundredth part of the Italian people."

In 1882 there were about 600,000 voters in Italy, but an extension of the franchise, made in that year, increased their number to about 2,500,000 in a population of 28,000,000. Nevertheless, in the general elections of October of the same year, only about a million of votes were cast.

Catholics are permitted, and even urged, to take part in municipal and provincial elections, but, for the reasons mentioned by Cardinal Manning, and because of the positive declaration of the Pope, that it was not *expedient* for them to vote at general elections, they kept away from the polls in October, 1882. Liberal, nominal Catholics, it is true, voted then as on previous occasions of the same kind, but *they* would not give their suffrages to men disposed to favor a restoration of the temporal power.

And, even were all Catholic voters to go to the polls, to-day, in Italy, they would be powerless to return to Parliament a majority of men favorable to such a measure. They are without political organization and training. They are strangers to the arts of the political wire-puller. Their opponents have been schooled to both, in the secret revolutionary societies, and at the point of the

dagger. They have the government and its machinery, and the military power in their hands, and would know well how to prevent the election of a Catholic majority, or, if it were returned, how to declare the election invalid, as they did in Piedmont, in 1857. It is enough to say that, at the municipal elections, in which Catholics are allowed to take part, comparatively few good Catholics are ever returned.

But may we not count on an uprising, at no distant day, of the Catholic masses against the tyrannical oligarchy that now oppresses them? Not at all. As well might you expect a flock of sheep, when driven to the shambles, to turn on their shepherd and his dog. The Italian people have many virtues, natural and supernatural, but courage is not one of them.

Many in Italy, and elsewhere, look to the Revolution itself to bring about a speedy restoration of the temporal power, on the principle that, when things come to the worst, they are likely to mend. The present government, they say, cannot last. The offspring of the Revolution, it will soon be devoured by the monster that gave it birth. The social republic will take its place, and, as this would be incompatible with even the existence of civilized society, a stable government of some sort must follow, a necessary factor of which will be the independent sovereignty of the Pope. This may all be, but, for our part, we cannot see a way to light and order out of the chaos which these persons predict.

The present condition of Italy is sad indeed. Her future is dark and threatening. A crisis in her affairs cannot be far off. But, when the present government shall have been swept away, and an atheistic or social republic shall have taken its place, will the Roman question be any nearer settlement than it is at present? Who can think so that considers the record of the present French republic, which, in satanic hatred of the Church, far surpasses its predecessor of 1793! And, when the republic shall have given place to a dictator, self-appointed, or chosen by a congress of the great powers, will the situation be any better? It is, to say the least, very doubtful. A dictator has power for good, but no less for evil; and dictators have, as a rule, thus far in the world's history, inclined to the latter. Dictators, and absolute rulers generally, have caused more harm to the Church than even anti-Christian republics have been able to do.

In enumerating the causes likely to bring about a restoration of the temporal power, many Catholic writers lay much stress on the probable intervention, to this end, of the European powers. Those writers remind us that no European government has approved the seizure of the Papal territory in 1870; and that leading statesmen, in England and on the continent, and even some of the founders

of Italian unity themselves, have, time and again, asserted that the Roman question is not simply an Italian, but an international question. This is all very true; but we fear the European governments will be only too well pleased to see matters remain as they are in Italy, for long years to come. All those governments are more or less erastian. The non-Catholic governments want no church but a state church, that will be their creature and do their bidding, and take the law from their lips. If the so-called Catholic, but really Febronian, or infidel governments, do not go thus far, it is because they dare not. Certain it is that both Protestant and Catholic governments are ready to do all in their power to hinder, where they cannot wholly destroy, the freedom of the Church. They are, and always have been, especially jealous of Papal authority. If they ever felt any devotion to St. Peter, it was to St. Peter in chains. They might not object to a Pope with a primacy of mere honor, who would leave them the appointment of bishops, pastors and professors, and the bestowal of church benefices, and who would not trouble them with doctrinal decisions, bulls, encyclicals, and the like; but they will never take kindly to one who claims to exercise real, though but spiritual, jurisdiction over any number of their subjects. They are not, then, likely to trouble Italy about putting an end to the present virtual captivity of the Roman Pontiff. So far from this, they rejoice at it. He is not as firmly bound as they would wish to see him, but they are willing to let very-well alone, for the present. Italy is now doing their work for them; and as long as she continues to do it, they will not interfere with her, at least, for sake of the Pope.

But, could the Pope be reconciled to Italy, could he, whilst continuing to exercise his primacy of jurisdiction over Catholics in all lands, become even the first and most favored subject of the Italian King, then, indeed, their non-intervention in the Roman question would soon cease, they would develop a wonderful zeal in upholding the rights of their Catholic subjects, and insist even on the restoration of the temporal power, if there were no other way open to them of putting an end to such an alliance. Short of such a reconciliation, which is impossible, they will never interfere in behalf of the Pope, unless compelled to do so by force of public opinion. When European Catholics rise superior to dynastic disputes and race prejudices, and in their several countries unite in choosing only such representatives as will care for their highest interests at home and abroad, then, and no sooner, can their governments be induced to favor the independence of the Holy See. But, though there are signs of such an awakening, just now, in France, Austria, and Spain, we fear we shall have to wait long for any important results to come of it.

But, though we cannot now see how the temporal power is to be recovered, we should not on this account despair of its restoration. When Rome is in question, we should leave a much wider margin for the direct action of Divine Providence there than in any other place. The temporal power is necessary to the well-being of the Church, and God will give it back, in His own good time and in His own way.

Every legitimate society has a right to freedom. If it have a right to exist, it has a right not to be impeded in seeking the end for which it was organized. If this be true of all societies, it must be eminently so of the Church, which was instituted for the highest and holiest of purposes—the glory of God and the salvation of souls. She has the right to labor for these ends, and, therefore, to use the means necessary to accomplish them. Other societies may change and be changed. They carry within them the seeds of dissolution. Good and beneficial at first, they may, in time, become bad or useless. In such case, the authority under which they were organized can modify or dissolve them. But the Church is immutable. The work she has to do is always, and everywhere, holy and necessary. Her Divine Founder made her a perfect and an independent society. He asked no charter for her from any civil government. For three hundred years she lived and labored and grew, in spite of all the civil governments with which she had been brought in contact. She can do so again; but who will say that fierce and bloody persecution should be her normal condition, or one in which she should acquiesce? No, those centuries of suffering she endured in her early history, were permitted to show that she was divine, that our faith is “the victory that overcometh the world,” and “the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth,” and to encourage her children, who in after times would, here and there, be made to know the bitterness of oppression. Freedom and peace are, to say the least, as necessary to the Church as to civil society, and it is her right, and her duty, to use every means in her power to secure both.

But, unless the Pope be free, the Church cannot be free. No society is free if its central government and executive are, or can be, hindered and hampered in the exercise of their functions, and deprived of the means necessary to discharge them in a proper manner. Such freedom the Pope cannot enjoy, unless he is his own master. If not his own master, his administration must always be, more or less, at the mercy of the government under which he lives. He must, then, be a sovereign. But a sovereign he cannot be without a territory of his own, or, in other words, without temporal power. And here I would remark that the Pope, as a subject, would be more likely to be restricted in his

liberty than anybody else. The reason is, that the civil power has always been most jealous of the spiritual. The Cæsars were so jealous of it that they made themselves chief pontiffs as well as emperors. The Christian Greek emperors constantly interfered in Church matters, and, as far as they could, sought to usurp ecclesiastical authority. The German emperors, and the kings of the middle and later ages, as a rule, did the same. And, at the time of the "Reformation," all the Protestant sovereigns returned, in this respect, to Cæsarism pure and simple. They founded national churches, and took the government of them into their own hands. Queen Victoria is, to-day, supreme head of the Church of England, and every Anglican bishop, before assuming possession of his see, takes the following oath: "I do verily testify and declare that your Majesty is the only supreme governor of this, your realm, in spiritual and ecclesiastical things, as well as in temporal, and that no foreign prelate or potentate has any jurisdiction within this realm; and I do acknowledge and confess to have and hold the bishopric of N., and the possessions of the same, entirely, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty, and of the imperial crown of this your Majesty's realm . . . so help me God," etc.

There is, then, a good deal of truth in the saying of Odilon Barrot, that "the two powers, the temporal and the spiritual, had been united in Rome that they might be kept separate in the rest of the world."

Non-Catholic sovereigns claim spiritual authority over their subjects as of direct right coming to them from God or from society. The Popes do not claim their temporal sovereignty for its own sake, but as a means to preserve the independence of their spiritual authority, and only to such an extent as is necessary to secure this object. And yet the claim of civil rulers in this matter excites little surprise and no indignation in those who scout that of the Popes as anti-Christian and subversive of popular rights!

The Pope should be free, not only in fact, but in appearance also. And this is another argument, drawn from the infirmity of human nature, in favor of the temporal sovereignty. Good and enlightened Catholics know and feel that whatever may be the political or social position of the Pope, his action in all that relates to faith and morals and the government of the Church will always be true, and just, and impartial. But all Catholics are not good and enlightened. Many, and especially Catholic rulers, would not give him credit for the foresight or the disinterestedness necessary to keep him from bias, even in such matters, were he to become the subject of a particular power. And as to non-Catholic governments having Catholic subjects, we could not of course expect them to do so. "The Pope," said Napoleon I., "is far from

Paris, and this is well; he is not at Madrid or Vienna, and hence we uphold his spiritual authority. At Madrid and Vienna people can say the same. Think you that, if the Pope were at Paris, the Viennese or Spaniards would consent to receive his decisions? It is, then, a fortunate circumstance that he is in old Rome, holding the balance between Catholic sovereigns, bending a little to the strongest, and then standing erect when the strongest becomes an oppressor. The ages have done this, and they have done it well. It is the best and the most beneficent institution for the government of souls; and saying so, I speak not as a bigot, but as a reasonable man."

This wisdom came too late to Napoleon to avert from himself the consequences of his misdeeds in this very matter.

It was, then, to secure the liberty of the Church, and as far as possible to disarm the suspicions of kings and peoples, that, in the good providence of God, the Popes gradually acquired temporal dominion. It came to them by the very best of titles, by the will of the people and the consent of the secular princes, who thought they had a right to bestow it. In the beginning of the eighth century, to go no farther back in tracing the origin of the temporal power, the people of Rome and of Ravenna, pressed on the one side by the Lombards, who sought to enslave them, and on the other abandoned by the Greek emperor, whose subjects they had been, called on the Pontiffs to assume their temporal government and save them from the fate that threatened them. In 749 Ravenna was taken by the barbarians. Rome was saved from their fury by Pepin, King of France, who confirmed the Pope in the temporal power with which the people had already invested him. His claim to it was further strengthened by twelve hundred years of possession, by countless benefactions to his people, to Italy, and to Europe, and by the recognition of all civilized nations up to the present day.

On the 20th September, 1870, the troops of Victor Emmanuel entered Rome through the breach of *Porta Pia*. Twelve days afterwards, whilst the people were still terrorized by the scenes they had passed through, and by the hordes of camp-followers and desperadoes that had followed the army into the city, a *plebiscite* was ordered by the usurping authority to decide for or against the continuance of the temporal power of the Pope. Groups of hired ruffians were posted at all the polls to intimidate unwelcome voters. None came. Only forty-six votes were given for the Pope, and forty thousand for the invaders! This was over-doing matters with a vengeance. Our own ballot-box stuffers would be ashamed of such work.

Why, in February, 1871, four months after this *plebiscite*, fifty-two Roman noblemen published an address to the Catholic asso-

ciations of the world, in which they say of their fellow-citizens that the "immense majority of them have always remained faithful, and, with the help of God, are firmly resolved never to alter their line of conduct. In testimony whereof they call on the history of the past and the facts of the present, unaltered by calumny and passion." In an allocution, delivered on the 16th of the same month, the Pope says: "I am proud of and thank the Romans for their patient endurance of the present trials, especially of such a number holding official appointments, who, for honor, loyalty, and conscience sake, prefer every privation to betrayal of their trust or felony." And, on the 24th July following, the Primary Roman Society for Catholic Interests presented the Holy Father an address expressive of their loyalty to his temporal authority, signed by 27,161 male Roman citizens of full age, the residence of the signer being appended to each name, and this at a season when thousands of the upper classes were absent from the city. Out of forty-six magistrates in the city, only five transferred their allegiance to the new government. In the Finance Department, out of 1439 employees, only 344 took office under it. In the Interior Department, out of fifty-three, only seventeen remained in office. And in the army, out of 586 officers, only fifty-eight retained their positions. The others, though offered the same rank in the Italian army as they had held in that of the Pope, would not accept it. These facts tell us what we should think of the *plebiscite* held by the Piedmontese after the seizure of Rome in 1870. On the first anniversary of that event the young men of Rome, in an address to the Holy Father, said: "Our hearts burned with indignation when we witnessed the impudence of your enemies, who dared to lie on parchment and marble, representing as a vote of the Roman people that ridiculous *plebiscite*, which was nothing but the vote of a horde of immigrants, strangers, public criminals, and the few cowards who allowed themselves to be drawn over by threats and promises. To this atrocious insult we, to-day, the young men of Rome, your children and subjects, come to oppose a solemn profession of fidelity and devotion, unalterable unto death, to your sacred person, and to the invincible rights in virtue of which you are sovereign Pontiff and our only sovereign."

In 1871 was passed the so-called Law of Guarantees, by which it was provided that the Pope should be regarded and treated as the *guest*, not the subject, of the King of Italy. It made his person as inviolable as that of the civil ruler, and assigned him a yearly pension for his support. But these guarantees did not guarantee. They are mere statutes, depending for their permanence on a parliamentary majority. The authority that made can modify or abolish them at pleasure. The late Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mancini, declared, as he had always held, that they are purely

domestic ordinances, in regard to which foreign powers had nothing whatever to say. The liberty of the Church cannot rest on such a basis as this. Nothing less than the social and political independence of the Holy See can insure its permanence.

Then, in point of fact, the Pope has not been free since the entrance of the Piedmontese into Rome. Infidel revolutionists, in and out of Parliament, have been allowed to insult him with impunity. Several persons have been brought before the tribunals for having spoken or written in a manner disrespectful to the King. No such effort has been made to uphold the dignity of the Pope. He is obliged to remain in his palace, for his presence in the streets of Rome would certainly lead to disturbance of the public peace. The joy of the people at seeing him could not be restrained, and its manifestation would provoke a counter demonstration by the partisans of the Revolution. Only a few years ago the crowd coming out of St. Peter's, on a festival day, caught sight of him at a window of the Vatican. A spontaneous outburst of joy went up to him from his children as they knelt for his blessing. The authorities were soon alarmed, and in a short time the soldiers from a neighboring guard-house were sent to clear the piazza at the point of the bayonet.

Everybody knows how, on the night of the 20th September, 1881, the procession accompanying the remains of Pius IX. to their last resting place was attacked by a band of ruffians, who insulted and struck the mourners, and threatened to throw the body of the dead Pontiff into the Tiber. Next day one of the radical organs, the *Lega della Democrazia*, commenting on this outrage, said: "They," the remains of the Pope, "were laid in the tomb with hisses. Our hearts echoed those hisses. Pius IX. was a fool. He personified the Catholic Church now become a monstrous folly. We applaud those hisses." We may imagine, then, what a living Pope, hailed by the vivas of his people, would have to expect from such miscreants.

The Pope can receive visitors and deputations, but so may a prisoner in the penitentiary or a servant in a private house. He can write encyclicals, but the government can prevent their circulation; and, in fact, it has on several occasions sequestered the newspapers that published them. It has control of the mails, of the telegraph, and of travel, and may, whenever it pleases, limit or cut off communication between him and Catholics in and out of Italy.

It took possession of the pontifical palace of the Quirinal, the place where the cardinals used to meet for the election of the Pope. It seized all the charitable institutions of the Papal States, and took into its own hands the management of the universities for the higher education of ecclesiastics and seculars. It suppressed the

religious orders, which Pius IX. declared to be his most powerful arm in the government of the Church, and appropriated their property; and by forcing all their religious corporations, even the missionary congregation of the Propaganda, to convert their real estate into depreciated government securities, reduced their revenues some forty per cent., and imperilled the remainder. It thus greatly diminished the means placed by the faithful of all nations at the disposal of the Holy Father for the proper government of the Church. It has refused to recognize acts of episcopal jurisdiction, even in regard to the appointment of pastors when the bishops had not received the royal *placet*; and even when they were permitted to present their Bulls of nomination to the Minister of Worship, they had long to wait before being allowed to exercise their functions. No wonder, then, that Pius IX. declared that he was "under a hostile government," and that his successor has told the world that, in Rome, he is not free to do even acts of charity. This was said in allusion to the outcry raised against him by the revolutionists, last year, for having built a magnificent cholera hospital beside the Vatican, so that he might be able to visit the patients without being obliged to pass through the streets.

Catholics are not opposed to the unity of Italy. Why should they be? They have no sympathy with the little despotisms that ruled there before 1859. Those despotisms were not as bad as the Revolution has painted them, but they were bad enough to make their restoration undesirable to all lovers of rational liberty. They did not rob the Church, but they greatly interfered with her freedom of action, and their fall was but a just retribution for their transgressions in this respect. We desire to see Italy united, prosperous, and great. She has, in her people, in her soil, and in her geographical position, everything that is necessary to make her become such. But such she cannot be, as long as her government antagonizes the religion of her people, despoils the Church, and holds its visible Head in virtual captivity. She can become a great nation without the States of the Church, or, at least, without as much of them as is necessary to secure the political independence of the Pope. The cession of Nice and Savoy to France, in 1860, was not thought to have materially injured the prospects of Sardinia. On the contrary, in the opinion of Victor Emmanuel and his ministers, it improved them, by strengthening the alliance between it and Napoleon III. The restoration—let us say—of the Romagna, to the Pope, would be productive of far more beneficial results to the present kingdom of Italy. It would tranquillize the minds of its people in regard to that which they hold most dear, their faith; it would allay the indignation it has excited in the hearts of Catholics, in every part of the world, and, in time, conciliate their respect, and gain an ally with three hundred millions of willing, loving, spiritual subjects,

the truest and the noblest ally any government can have, and the best friend Italy has known in the past, or can know in the future.

But, we confess, we see no reason whatever to hope that the present rulers of Italy will ever willingly consent to even a partial restoration of territory to the Holy See. They are the Revolution, godless and anti-Christian, and the ruin of their country would be a lesser evil in their eyes than reconciliation with the Church.

How long the present state of things in Italy is likely to endure, nobody can now foresee. Nevertheless, the intimate connection between the temporal power and the freedom of the Church bids us hope for its speedy termination. In his letter of March 26th, 1860, Pius IX. says: "The Catholic Church, founded and instituted by Christ, for the eternal salvation of men, being a perfect society, in virtue of her institutions, must enjoy such freedom as that, in the exercise of her sacred ministry, she may not be subject to any civil power. And as, in order to labor with that necessary freedom, she stands in need of certain privileges and prerogatives, corresponding to the conditions and requirements of the times, Divine Providence, with singular wisdom, disposed that, after the fall of the Roman Empire and its division into several kingdoms, the Roman Pontiff, made by Christ the head and centre of the universal Church, should obtain a temporal principality. In this way, it was wisely arranged by God himself that, amongst the multitude and variety of secular princes, the Supreme Pontiff should enjoy that political independence so necessary to him, in order that he may exercise, throughout the entire world, and without let or hindrance, his spiritual power and jurisdiction. It is easy to understand, therefore, how this principality of the Roman Church, although of its own nature merely temporal, in virtue of its sacred destiny and its being so closely bound up with the supreme interests of Christianity, is invested with a character altogether sacred."

"We recognize," said the four hundred bishops assembled in Rome in 1862, "the civil principality of the Holy See as a necessary appurtenance, and manifestly instituted by the providence of God. Nor do we hesitate to declare that this same civil principality, in the present condition of human affairs, is absolutely requisite for the adequate and free government of the Church and souls. Undoubtedly it behooveth that the Roman Pontiff, head of the universal Church, should not be the subject of any prince, or the *guest* of any, but, seated on his own throne, in his own kingdom, he should, from his very position, be perfectly free to defend the Catholic faith, and rule and govern the entire Christian republic. . . . And, indeed, how could the pastors of the Church, with any security, come together here from all parts of the globe to treat with your Holiness on matters of the gravest importance, if

there were in this city, and in these states, a ruler who might be jealous of their principles, or be himself suspected by, or hostile to, them?"

Such being the necessity of the temporal independence of the Holy See, we must, unless some extraordinary trial be in store for the Church, hope for its restoration, at no distant day, by means we do not now foresee.

The present position of the Pope is nothing new in history. His predecessors have often been honored by the enmity of more formidable tyrants than the actual rulers of Italy. More than fifty times have the Popes been deprived, in whole or in part, of their temporal domain. More often still have they had to take the road to exile from their capital. For seventy years they lived at Avignon, in France. Their absence was always disastrous to Rome, and to Italy; their return, an occasion for hope and joy to their people. And they *did* always return. Their enemies were humbled and chastised, but they triumphed. Adolph Thiers once said: "Whoever eats of the Pope, dies of it." The history of the Church attests the truth of this. Among those who, in recent times, meddled with the Patrimony of St. Peter, was Napoleon I. He annexed the States of the Church to his empire, and soon after signed his abdication, in the very palace of Fontainebleau where he had imprisoned Pius VII. And then came Elba, Waterloo, and St. Helena. His son, Napoleon II., was proclaimed King of Rome, but he did not live to wear a crown. Napoleon III. plotted with Cavour to despoil Pius IX., his benefactor and the godfather of his child, of his northern provinces, and immediately afterwards went to Sedan, Wilhelmshöhe and Chiselhurst, and his son, the scion of a military dynasty, was slaughtered by naked savages in southern Africa. Cavour was cut off in the middle of his ambitious career, and Victor Emmanuel and many others who took part in the spoliation of the last-named Pontiff, met with sudden and unprovided deaths.

And what has been, will be. "The hand of the Lord is not shortened that it cannot save, neither is his ear heavy that it cannot hear." He will know how to defend His Church and humble her enemies. "What God's will is," wrote Louis Veuillot, "we all know. It is what He has always willed, and still wishes, the advancement, the greatness, and glory of His holy and immortal Church. Where Bismarck reigns at present, Henry IV. reigned before; and he set up an anti-Pope, and continued the fight, and thought himself the victor. Gregory VII. died at Salerno, in exile, and courtiers of the emperor were heard to say: 'Hildebrand is the last of his race.' But the emperor died, too, and Hildebrand was resuscitated. How many persecutors of the Church have

died!—how many Popes have been resuscitated! Shed blood, then, make bad laws, enroll soldiers. Decree that good is evil, and evil good. You are but mortal. Christianity is not. Christians are endowed with divine obstinacy; they will resist you, they will use you, they will bury you. They will bury your great statesmen, your victorious generals, your powerful writers. You may reduce the world to ruins, they will continue to live. They will rise out of the ashes, and the heap of ruins you have accumulated will serve for your tomb. The earth laid waste by you will always furnish enough of wood to make a cross, and a spot whereon to plant it. In spite of yourselves, you will have the honor—though you deem it an affront—of bearing aloft the standard of Him that liveth."

ART AND ARTISTS.

GIORGIO VASARI.

RICHES and art go hand in hand. As a land waxes fat, art flourishes: if not true art, then some more or less skilful pretender.

We have been growing rich, and it is evident that art, or some pretender, has settled among us. The Museum of Art, with its pretentious, and not too artistic, exterior, is as much a feature of every self-respecting city as the Opera House or the Soldiers' Monument. We have a *salon* every day of the year at the art dealers, while the Academy, the Black and White Association, the Rejected, the Etchers' Club, the Water Color Society, give us *salon* after *salon* as the seasons chase each other. There is, too, the loan-collection at the club, or the kirmess; the private view at the palace of the railway prince or the coal-oil potentate, and the very public view at the ever-recurring auction sale of the last bankrupted financier. Every daily paper has an art column, the work of an art reporter, if not of a real art critic; and there are many weeklies whose whole subject is art. Our magazines give us clever wood-cuts, after the best old and new masters, with interesting articles about famous painters and famed paintings. The best English, French, and German art periodicals have special agencies in our large cities: we read the "*Gazette des Beaux Arts*," "*L'Art*,"

"The Portfolio," or, if these be above our means, the "Art Journal," or the "Magazine of Art." From English and American publishers there is a constant supply of "Art Primers," "Lives of Great Artists," "Wonders of Painting." In our schools the art teaching is so general and so thorough that boys and girls think nothing of throwing off a design for a wall paper between tea and bed-time. More than one of our colleges support an "Art School," and a permanent exhibition; and in no well-regulated young ladies' academy is the curriculum looked upon as complete without the "Lectures on Art" to advanced pupils.

Certainly, all this shows a kind of interest in matters of art and in artists. This interest is in itself desirable. Without it we can know little of art; but with it one may not know much. Under the influence of fashion it is easily acquired or affected. Of itself it does not give knowledge, nor does it make taste; and without knowledge and taste there can be no real appreciation of what art is, of its objects, limitations, methods. Nor can the mere looking at paintings, sculptures, or prints, the skimming over of art periodicals, the reading of primers, or of illustrated "Lives," the designing of wall papers, nor even the listening to six lectures in a twelve-month, on "Ancient and Modern Art," supply any one with the means necessary to an intelligent understanding of that most delightful, instructive, elevating, inspiring, refining thing, Art.

The painter, who follows a long and severe course of study in line and color, will in time learn certain principles of beauty. Practice of hand and eye will force these principles on him. But we, who do not draw or paint, how are we to acquire these principles? Not by intuition, surely; nor by revelation. The patient student who has acquired them, is he, therefore, an artist? By no means. As, then, the student, who by practice has acquired much that it is necessary to know, may still be far from having the knowledge and view of art without which one cannot be an artist, so we, who know so much less, cannot rapidly gain from the picture gallery and the primer what will make us, not judges of art, but even true lovers of art. One cannot love what one does not know. All works of art are things of the mind, of the soul—not merely things of the hand. The most skilful manipulator of the brush, the most cunning combiner of colors, cannot create a great painting: he may paint a pretty picture. It is intelligence and feeling that make the artist. Being a thing of the soul, then, art must be an intelligent thing, a thing of laws. What are these laws? The primer does not tell us, nor can we elaborate them from the *salon*. If we try to do this, we are as like to learn lawlessness as law; for, to hang on an exhibition-wall is not to be a work of art. Inasmuch, therefore, as we do not draw or paint, we are shut out

from a certain art knowledge. Can we acquire this knowledge? Yes, to some extent. We may gather it, in part, from the artist, speaking, or writing; we may round our knowledge by continued and careful observation. And the laws of art? These, too, we may learn by reading and observation; but, above all, by thought. Law is a matter of reason; wherefore, we must reason, and reason closely, if we wish thoroughly to know the laws of art.

Formally to reason about what seems such a wholly pleasurable thing as art, would not be attractive to many minds, least of all to immature minds. The method would repel some and confuse others. Before one has done with it, the thin duodecimo volume on æsthetics outweighs an elephantine folio. How, moreover, are we to be certain that our teacher is not misleading us? For, to write on æsthetics no more implies sound principles than does painting a picture imply artistic knowledge or power.

The history of art is the story of the development of the principles and practice of art. This story is the more interesting, and the more useful, inasmuch as it is a connected record of the thoughts, sayings, and doings of the men who successively have aided in developing art. To read the history of art is to follow art from its first weak growth up to its blooming-time, and again down through its sad decay. From naïveté, ignorance, and ugliness, we see it develop simplicity, knowledge, beauty. We see how this was effected: we have learned what art is. There is no more certain way.

Now, a skilful historian may teach us much in a large and general manner, sacrificing many a charming detail, eliminating many an interesting personage. It may be that we shall have enough; it were better if we had more. This more we can get from biography. A well-written, careful story of the life of a great artist gives us a deep insight into art itself. We see not only the artist and his work, we see the work being done; the aims of a great artistic mind, the outside training, the self-education, the method of that mind; the surroundings, trials, obstacles, successes, aiding or impeding the development of that mind;—what are a thousand *salons* to this one story in fitting us to know and appreciate art?

The best help to a knowledge of art, to judgment in art, would surely be a history of art, wherein, tracing its rise and development, we should learn its principles and practice; see them unfold themselves before us; and, at the same time, become intimately acquainted with great artists. With such a history we would start aright in our story of art, or our play with it; if we had already started, and started wrong, we could the more quickly retrace our steps, and strike the right path. Giotto, Angelico, the Frate, Leonardo, Raphael would no longer be mere names to us, but living, speaking teachers.

If we wish to learn something of art in this right way, and not to be mere gadders in galleries, or gabblers about light and shade, tone and perspective, we have an old book, easy to get, wherefrom we can gather, with a deal of instruction and pleasure, sound principles about art, intimate acquaintance with the masters, a view of art from the beginning, and a detailed story of the rise and progress of the great and new modern-art, from its first weak effort up to its strong and glorious perfection. The book which will help us to all these good things is Giorgio Vasari's "Lives of the Painters."

Let us open the "Lives," not to acquaint ourselves with the plan and scope of the work, nor to read here and there a page about Orgagna, or Buffalmacco, or Ghiberti, or Castagno, but, first of all, to learn who was Vasari. At the end of the "Lives" we shall find his own story, written by himself; and if we know his friends, teachers, fellow-workers, we have only to turn to their "lives" for added detail of his life told in proper time and place.

Giorgio Vasari was born in the year 1512, at Arezzo, a pleasant Tuscan city, lying some fifty miles south and east of Florence: a city proud of its Etruscan ancestry; proud, too, of having given birth to that Mæcenas, who was the friend of Augustus, Virgil, and Horace. Petrarch, Spinello, the painter; Margaritone, the sculptor; Guido, the founder of the modern school of music,—these had not lessened her pride or her fame.

More than a century before Giorgio, his great-grandfather, Lazzaro Vasari, had gained considerable reputation as a painter in Arezzo and the neighborhood. Intimate friend of that Piero della Francesca who was master of perspective, and, for his time, of anatomy, Lazzaro grew in aim and knowledge, and from painting little things well—decorating the trappings of condottieri—he soon advanced to larger and better work in fresco and on glass. In Giorgio's day, Lazzaro's inventions covered more than one chapel wall in Arezzo. Before Lazzaro's day, and, indeed, during and after his day, the Vasari were potters. First at Cortona, afterwards at Arezzo, they copied the ancient Etruscan ware. Giorgio's grandfather, another Giorgio, rediscovered the secret of the old red and black coloring, dug up Etruscan remains, and, while modelling his vases, found time to acquire no mean skill in basso-rilievo.

Still it was not Lazzaro, or his son, who had brought renown to the family, but Lazzaro's sister's son, the great Luca Signorelli. Luca had studied in Lazzaro's house under Piero della Francesca, and with such avail that he went beyond that master in all wherein he was masterly. In knowledge, vigor, daring, Luca

has not been equalled, unless it be by Michel-Angelo. To say that without Luca there would have been no Angelo, might be to say too much; but we can say that in fresco Luca did well all that Angelo did after him; that Angelo was a worker in the spirit of Luca, and with the same views of art; and what is more, that if the "Last Judgment" be Angelo's greatest work, it was great by reason of Luca, and still fell short of Luca. Thirty years before Angelo laid his first brush-stroke on the Sistine wall, Luca had painted the wondrous "Paradise" at Orvieto. There, with perfect skill in composition, with thorough science of perspective and foreshortening, with most powerful rendering of anatomical accuracy in limb, and bone, and muscle, he had combined grace, beauty, power, majesty, terror, in a series of vast and high conceptions not unworthy of Dante's lofty mind.

With the painter's strain in him, it does not surprise us that from his childhood Giorgio was given to drawing; more given to it, indeed, than pleased his good father, Antonio. Not that Antonio did not wish him to draw, and to draw well, but he wished him to know other good things as well as drawing. Signorelli, then an old man, gave Giorgio kind words and encouragement. He wanted no more. Still a child, he began to copy whatever good pictures there were in the churches of Arezzo. Then his father placed him with Guglielmo da Marsiglia, a painter on glass, a man of "active mind and great intelligence," who taught him the first principles of art.

In 1523, when Giorgio was eleven years old, a kinsman of his father, Cardinal Silvio Passerini, of Cortona, on his way to Florence, stopped at Arezzo. Taking Giorgio with him, Antonio went to pay his respects to the great man; and the Cardinal, pleased with the youth's skill in drawing, and with his recitations from the "Æneid," and, no doubt, with his general brightness and frankness, insisted on taking him to Florence. There Giorgio enjoyed great advantages. He was placed in the house of one Messer Niccolo Vespucci, a knight of Rhodes, who lived close by the Ponte Vecchio. For a drawing-master he had no less a man than Michel-Angelo himself, and his other studies he pursued, for two hours each day, in the company of no lesser personages than Ippolito and Alessandro dei Medici, under their tutor Giovanni Bolzani, who, on account of his love for the muses, was called, after the fashion of the time, Pierio.

Giorgio lost no time. He had lost none thus far: he never lost any afterwards. Under Angelo, whom he always worshipped, and who made or marred him, he worked with a will. When Michel went to Rome he placed his young pupil in the hands of that softer,

more graceful master, Andrea del Sarto, painter of the lovely "Madonna del Sacco," of the hardly less charming "Madonna of the Harpies," and of that head of Christ in the "Annunziata" at Florence, of which Vasari himself says: "This is so beautiful that for my part I do not know whether the human imagination could possibly conceive any more admirable representation of the head of the Redeemer."

With such masters and such friends, the world looked bright to Giorgio; but clouds came, and they were black clouds. The terrible plague laid its hand on Arezzo, and seized his loving father, Antonio. About the same time the good people, and the less bad, in Florence, rose up against the Medici, and, casting them out of the city, chose Christ to be their perpetual king. It is to be regretted that the political aspirations of a free people should have since moved them to depose so glorious a ruler.

However, the Medici went into exile, and Cardinal Passerini with them; and Vasari, now friendless, returned to his fatherless home. In the country about Arezzo he ventured to make his first efforts in color, painting devotional pictures for the peasants. When the plague had left the city he went there to live with an uncle, Don Antonio, and while with him painted his first picture in oil, three half-lengths of SS. Agatha, Rocco, and Sebastiano. Giorgio was now sixteen years old; and what metal there was in the youth we gather from his own telling: "And now, had my power equalled my desire, I should have become a tolerably good painter, so earnestly did I labor, and so anxiously did I study my art." Earnest labor, anxious study—these are the key to and the story of his life.

But the problems of art were not the only ones that Giorgio had to deal with. There were two younger brothers and three sisters, all dependent on his labor. Once more he sought the great city, Florence. There he had one dear friend, neither prince nor son of prince, but son of a weaver, Francesco de Rossi, known in art as Francesco Salviati. These two had formed a boys' acquaintance when Vasari first came to Florence with the Cardinal. The plague had separated them, at bitter cost to each, for they had grown to love each other like brothers. Now that both were poor, the bond was all the stronger. For two years they studied, and worked hard and zealously to gain bread and knowledge. Messer Niccolo Vespucci no longer harbored Giorgio: he took refuge in the workshop of a painter, Raffaello del Brescia. Work hard as he might at painting, Giorgio could not thereby support his brothers and sisters; so he set himself to learn the art of the goldsmith. When, in 1529, the army of Charles V. besieged Florence, Vasari went to Pisa, intending there to improve his condition by the practice of his

newly-acquired art; but in Pisa he received some commissions for works in fresco and oil, and was only too glad to put aside goldsmithing for his much beloved painting. Having filled these commissions, he went over the mountains to Bologna, and thence to Arezzo, being compelled to take this roundabout way by reason of the war. At his old home he found that family affairs had improved in his absence, thanks to his uncle's good management. Work came to his hands, and so well did he satisfy his patrons that he was selected to paint in fresco the portico and the ceiling of the Church of San Bernardo, which he did in a way not discreditable to a youth of eighteen. Fortune had once more smiled on him, and, indeed, from this time on to the day of his death, she favored him as constantly as fortune may favor.

He had just finished his paintings in San Bernardo when there came to Arezzo Ippolito de' Medici, his fellow-pupil of seven years before. Alessandro, his other class-mate, was now ruler of Florence, Ippolito himself a Cardinal; while in the Papal chair sat another Medici, Clement VII. Ippolito and Vasari were of about the same age. Since last they met, each had tasted the bitterness of misfortune: now, that Ippolito could help his friend, he was quick to do it. He took Giorgio into his service, and brought him to Rome. There he joyfully met once more Francesco de Rossi, whose talent had attracted the notice of Cardinal Salviati. Francesco having every encouragement and all leisure to continue his studies, Giorgio and he went to work with the old-time vigor. "My perpetual care," says Vasari, "was to draw with unwearying diligence night and day." He saw great men everywhere about him; why should not he attain to the same eminence? They were but of flesh and bones like himself. He would labor and study. There was no work of Raphael's that he and Francesco did not copy; there was, indeed, no work in the Vatican that they did not "fully copy or partially design." During a whole winter they remained in the chill rooms from morning till night. They had no time for anything but drawing. They ate a frugal breakfast, standing; they dined at their work on a piece of bread. To economize time, sometimes the one copied one subject, the other another; at night each copied the other's design.

Not content with this laborious training, Vasari made drawings after Michel-Angelo's grand Sistine ceiling, and copied every good work, ancient and modern, whether of sculpture, architecture, or painting. During his youth he was constant in this thorough system of study, and from each new city that he entered, he carried away designs of all its good things. He had determined to help his family and to become a great artist; and so "he disposed him-

self to endure every extremity of fatigue, and to shrink from no labor, no hardship, no watchfulness, no effort that might contribute to the desired end."

After these severe studies he tried his powers on a large canvas, choosing one of the favorite mythological subjects of the time. In this he succeeded to Ippolito's satisfaction, receiving not only kind words, but substantial pay and new orders. The desire to succeed made him neglect the advice of friends. His overworked body succumbed to the malarious Roman air. To give him a chance of recovery, they transported him in a litter to Arezzo. Only in the December following (1531) was he well enough to go up to Florence. There Duke Alessandro received him most kindly, providing him with a home, a servant, a seat at the ducal table, and means wherewith to live. Vasari set himself now "to learn from every one that knew;" he exercised himself in composition, and studied and copied the mighty works of Michel-Angelo in the new Sacristy of San Lorenzo;—the statues of Giuliano and Lorenzo dei Medici, and the Day and Night, Dawn and Twilight, mysterious as nature's self. Though barely twenty years of age, the Duke chose him to decorate some of the rooms in the Palazzo Medici, and added one honorable commission to another. As Alessandro had a passion for building, Vasari gave all his spare time to the study of architecture, and in this art he made such progress that, when Charles V. visited Florence, Giorgio was prepared to assume the direction of a large part of the decorative constructions set up for the occasion. Gaining knowledge, honor, profit, and skill in his art, he grew meantime in the Duke's favor, and counted on doing great things under his patronage. But, on the 6th of January, 1537, the assassin's dagger made an end of Alessandro. Clement VII. had died in 1534, Cardinal Ippolito in 1535—three great patrons gone within three short years!

Giorgio, so he tells us, now made up his mind to depend no longer on courts; hereafter he would depend on himself and on his work.

To follow his career from 1537 up to 1574, when he died, is to read the record of a busy life. Year by year he grew in reputation. He was sought throughout the length and breadth of Italy. Popes and Cardinals, priors and abbots, princes and merchants were eager to command his services. Could Giorgio have served them all, he would have done so. He was a ready designer and a facile painter, and ever the same constant student. When he went to Rome, in 1538, he gave the best part of his five months' stay to copying "all such antiquities, or other works," as he had not previously designed; "more particularly such things as were in the grottoes beneath

the earth." As to works of sculpture and architecture, not content with drawing these, he measured them all.

The greater part of these last thirty-seven years of his life was spent at Rome and Florence; but there are few important Italian cities in which he did not work. Venice, Verona, Mantua, Parma, Modena, Ravenna, Bologna, Pisa, Rimini, Perugia, Naples—to each of these he was called, and in each his fruitful fancy and rapid brush have left a lasting record of his talent and of the high repute in which it was held. No scheme was too large for Vasari; the larger it was, the more ready was he to undertake it. He wished "to accomplish the difficult and laborious in art;" and that he might be able to do this, he was "constantly seeking new inventions and phantasies."

By 1542 he had made himself easy in the world, married off two of his sisters, settled another in a convent, and built himself a new and commodious house at Arezzo. His early drawing-master, Michel-Angelo, whom Giorgio loved and admired throughout his life, had always been a friend to him; and when he was at Rome, in 1543, Michel, besides showing him much affection and giving him much good advice, made him known to the splendid Cardinal Farnese. Nor were these the only services that Angelo rendered him. After Duke Alessandro's death, whether from a doubt about his own powers or from lack of occasion, Vasari practiced architecture but little, though he did not give up the study of that art. Looking over the many designs he had made, Michel not only commended his ability, but encouraged him to take up architecture anew and in a better manner; this he did with such earnestness and such success that from this time onward it would not be easy to say whether Vasari was more architect or painter.

As year by year we run over the record of his works, we are astonished at their ever-growing number. Putting aside detail, he more than once tells his story in this fashion: This, and this, and this, I painted, "with many other pictures"; or, "at the same time I executed numerous designs, small pictures, and other works of minor importance, for many of my friends. These were, indeed, so numerous and so varied that it would be difficult for me to remember even a part of them."

He painted church and chapel walls, cathedral domes, the refectories of monasteries, palace halls and façades, the interiors of loggie, altar-pieces, portraits, subjects religious, historical, mythological, allegorical—all subjects in all places. Proud of his facility in design, and of his rapid execution, he was ever ready to attempt a feat. It was a time of great conceptions. Princes, churchmen, wealthy citizens, vied with one another in extravagant undertak-

ings. Feverishly impatient until their conceptions were realized, they were as lavish of means as they were saving of time. The artist had but two hands; they sought to supply him with a hundred. He was often forced to be a mere designer and overseer; a crowd of assistants, more or less capable, copying his cartoons under his hurried supervision. The artist's labor was immense; but it was hardly possible that it should add to his artistic credit. At the mercy of others, his designs often lost spirit, life, sense, beauty. The patron gained glory at the artist's expense. One of Vasari's experiences was as remarkable as it was unsatisfactory to himself. Cardinal Farnese, wishing to decorate the Hall of the Chancery, in the Palace of San Giorgio, so as to illustrate the life of the reigning pontiff, Paul III., entrusted the work to Vasari. To carry out the Cardinal's scheme, he found it necessary to remodel the hall. He made the architectural drawings, superintended their execution, supplied the cartoons for twenty different frescoes, including portraits of the Pope, of Sadoletto, Pole, Bembo, Contarini, Paolo Giovio, Michel-Angelo, Charles V., and Francis I., designed a goodly number of ornaments and inscriptions, and completed the whole work within one hundred days. "Being then young," says Vasari, sadly, "I thought only of complying with the wishes of the Cardinal; but it would have been better that I had toiled a hundred months, so only that I had done all with my own hand."

In 1550 Giammaria del Monte, who, as legate of Paul III., had opened the Council of Trent, was elected to the Papal chair under the name of Julius III. Vasari and Del Monte were close friends, and no sooner was the new Pope enthroned than he called upon Giorgio to aid him in carrying out his great schemes for adorning Rome. To Vasari he entrusted the design and superintendence of that tomb of the elder Cardinal di Monte, executed by Ammanati, in San Pietro in Montorio; with Vasari and Michel-Angelo he consulted about the continuation of the work on St. Peter's; and it was Vasari who made all the drawings for the fanciful and extravagant Vigna Julia, the Pope himself supplying the inventions.

Making a hurried journey to Florence in this year, Vasari was very kindly received by Duke Cosmo I., the successor of Alessandro. Cosmo, who had long wished to have Vasari about him, now gave him a pressing invitation to make his home in Florence. His many engagements forbade an immediate acceptance; but as soon as he was at liberty, in 1553, he returned to the "City of Flowers," and placed himself at the Duke's service. Active service it was: Cosmo was ever building new things, and rebuilding the old; making mean things rich, and ornate things sumptuous.

Through him Vasari's name has been linked with the great Florentine architects; with Arnolfo, Fra Sisto, Brunelleschi, Cronaca, Michelozzo, Alberti; and with the most admired structures of the beautiful city; with the Palazzo Vecchio, the Uffizi, the Pitti, the Palazzo Medici (now Riccardi), the Biblioteca Laurenziana; with Santa Maria Novella, Santa Croce, and the Duomo. At the same time that Vasari was constructing and reconstructing buildings, he was busy in decorating them. In addition to painting the "Hall of the Elements," he filled twelve rooms in the Palace with stories from the lives of the Medici, and with others showing the actions of illustrious women, Greek, Hebrew, Latin, and Tuscan. The great Hall of the Palazzo Vecchio he adorned with twenty large paintings, in which was told the history of Florence from the beginning up to his own time. When the prince, Don Francesco, was to marry Joanna, the Emperor's daughter, Vasari must supply the decorations, triumphal arches, views of all the piazzas in the larger Tuscan cities, views of fifteen of the principal cities of the empire, with much other ephemeral work.

Vasari it is who built that great corridor which, crossing the Arno, atop of the Ponte Vecchio, connects the Palazzo Vecchio with the Pitti; and he, too, designed the Portico degli Uffizi, under which we of the New World linger to study the faces of Dante, of Giotto, of Lorenzo il Magnifico, and of our godfather, Amerigo Vespucci. Besides adding a choir and chapels to Santa Maria Novella, designing a choir, altar, tabernacle, and fourteen chapels for Santa Croce, he built a palace for the Duke at Capraja, a church at Colle Mingoli, and fountains at Castello.

Between times he had gone to Rome. Pius V. sent for him in 1572 that he might paint the "Victory of Lepanto" and the "Death of Coligny," in the Sala Regia of the Vatican. Then he must work in the Pope's private chapel, and design sixty-eight cartoons for other chapels. Now he is chosen to succeed his drawing-master, Michel-Angelo, in superintending St. Peter's; now he must repair St. John Lateran's; now conduct the waters of the Acqua Vergine from Salma to Rome. Gregory XIII. will not do without him; he must complete the Sala Regia, which, begun by Paul III., had occupied thirteen painters successively for a term of twenty-eight years. Vasari has but one more thing in life to do. Seeking no higher glory, no more wealth, he declines an invitation to the Spanish court from Philip II.; he would round his labored, honored life by painting Brunelleschi's glorious dome, which crowns brave Florence, above the beauteous walls of Santa Maria del Fiore. He had just finished the Prophets in the Lantern, when death stopped his active mind and hand forever.

This is the man who wrote the "Lives of the Painters," in which is told the story of Italian art from Cimabue down to his own day; no mere sketch of painters' lives, but a detailed narration of their work, and not of painters' work only, but of the work of sculptor, architect, goldsmith, glass painter, modeller in clay, caster of bronze, niellist, and engraver. From his boyhood, for his own pleasure and instruction, and because of a certain affection for the memory of artists, Giorgio Vasari had made note of every detail concerning them which came within his way. By the year 1545 he had accumulated much useful material, the benefit of which we might never have so fully enjoyed were it not for a casual conversation. At that time he was painting the Hall of the Chancery for Cardinal Farnese. After his day's work he often went to sup at the Cardinal's, where he was certain to find a gathering of the most distinguished men, and of the brightest minds in Rome. One evening, the conversation turning on things of art, Paolo Giovio, whose museum gave him authority in such matters, bore the burden of the talk. Giovio, discoursing on the men who had made themselves eminent in art from Cimabue down, expressed the desire he himself felt to write a treatise about these great men, and elaborated his scheme at some length. Vasari, observing that Giovio's acquaintance with his subject was general rather than special, and thus vague and uncertain, while commending the idea, ventured to point out some of Giovio's errors and misconceptions. Directly the whole company, including Giovio, fell upon Vasari, insisting that he should undertake the work Giovio had suggested. This he was not anxious to do, on account of his many other engagements, and for the further reason that he doubted his powers as a writer. However, the Cardinal insisting, and Annibale Caro, Tolomei, and Molza, all men of acknowledged literary ability, adding their persuasions, he finally assumed the task.

With the old-time industry he now applied himself to gathering and arranging material for his book. By correspondence he sought information from distant places; he traced and read the manuscript notes of earlier artists; he consulted contemporary masters and students; he visited, described, and critically examined all the works in the cities through which he passed; he formed collections of the drawings of all good artists, and of models of statues and buildings. The ground was new; the difficulties were many and great; still Vasari did wonders. In 1550 he published a first edition, which was favorably received, bringing him much and well-deserved credit. No one saw its imperfections better than he: during the seventeen succeeding years he labored to amend them. Duke Cosmo encouraged and aided him, affording him every

facility for making new researches throughout Italy. Thus he was enabled to correct errors, to acquire more exact information, and to add many new "Lives." In 1568 he issued a second edition, illustrated with engraved portraits, the drawings for which he had procured, not without great "labor, cost, and pains."

The friend of Popes, of princes, of the most illustrious patrons, literati, and artists of his time, Vasari's position certainly afforded him exceptional advantages in his undertaking. Recalling his artist contemporaries, we find ourselves in the company of the most famous Masters of the Renaissance. Angelo, Del Sarto, Sodoma, Pontormo, Di Credi, Bandinelli, Del Piombo, Giulio Romano, Marc Antonio, Titian, Veronese, Sansovino, Palma Vecchio, Cellini, Ghirlandajo—all these he knew and associated with. Bramante, Botticelli, Francia, Perugino, Da Vinci, Raphael, were still living when Vasari was born; Giorgione had died but a year, Filippo Lippi but seven, and Mantegna but six years before Vasari's birth; so that he was within speaking distance of still another circle of illustrious artists, whose names the few we have mentioned will bring to the reader's mind. From Giotto to Vasari was but one hundred and seventy-six years. The immediate descendants of the fathers of Italian art had just gone; the traditions were fresh; the sources of information were plentiful and reliable; how plentiful and how reliable, almost any one of the "Lives," taken at random, will show.

In a simple, unaffected way Vasari puts before us not only the artist, but the man; his virtues, foibles, idiosyncrasies. Just in his judgment of each artist's work and powers, he is not less just in his judgment of personal character. With him justice does not mean severity. He is kindly-spoken; has a good word, praise, for all good things, and nothing ill to say beyond the truth. From individual virtue, or weakness, he is ever prompt to draw a moral; his aim being not merely to tell a story, or to make a catalogue, but to teach his younger fellow-artists, and those who were to come after him, the way to succeed, and the way to avoid failure. How high his purpose was, we may gather from his "Dedication" to Duke Cosmo in the edition of 1550, and from his address "To the Artists in Design" in 1568. To acquire praise as a writer has not been his object, but rather the glory of art and the honor of artists. As an artist he wished "to celebrate the industry and revive the memory of those who, having adorned and given life to the arts, do not merit that their names and works should be forgotten." He hoped "that the example of so many able men might be of advantage to those who study the arts, and no less those who have taste for and pleasure in them; and that his words might serve as a

spur, moving each to continue laboring worthily, and to seek to advance continually from good to better." Surely it is safer to try to learn something about art and artists from one moved by these good aims, than from some mere maker of books.

The fund of sprightly anecdote, by which Vasari illustrates the character of both artist and patron, the lively pictures he presents of the Italian life, and customs, of the time, and his frequent references to important social and political events, let us into the history, and the spirit, of the Italian renaissance. We become familiar with the great men, hear them speak, see them act. When we have finished "*The Lives*," we have learned more of the springs that moved men's minds in those days, than we can learn from any ordinary history of the period. Indeed, it may be safely said that one must have read Vasari, fully to appreciate certain sides of the renaissance.

His simple style wins our favor. From the first page, we feel secure of his truthfulness, and of his honesty of purpose. He is modest, too, and always Christian. He glorifies great men; but much more God, whose work they are. As we read of his relations with Salviati, Angelo, Gherardi, and the Medici, we cannot but be moved by the warmth of his friendship, his kindness of heart, his lively sense of gratitude; but these rare good qualities do not impress us more than does his constant, manly sense of religion. His acts gave proof of the sincerity of his words. When he had become easy in fortune, he built, at his own expense, and endowed a chapel and decanate in the Deanery at Arezzo, painting the chapel with his own hand. Therein he lovingly entombed the bodies of his father, mother, and immediate relatives. This work he did, "as an acknowledgment (although but a small one) of the Divine goodness, and an evidence of his thankfulness for the infinite favors and benefits which God has vouchsafed to confer upon him."

It would be hard to find a man better equipped for his work; would it not? Honest, truthful, conscientious, generous, patient, thorough, having a rare position among artists, rare facilities to pursue a well considered object, and a serious aim,—what was there wanting? Nothing, if his knowledge of the principles and practice of art fitted him to judge the things of art. Now, it is true that, notwithstanding all that Vasari painted, he has not taken rank among the greatest painters. It would be singular if he had. His talent of ready composition, and facility of brush, with his willingness to undertake everything for everybody, made it impossible that he should produce master-works. These are born of calm reflection, or enthusiasm, and of leisurely execution. Still,

Vasari painted more than one creditable picture. To be among the first, where the first were so great, was not easy; it was even less easy for him, whose admiration for the design of Michel-Angelo made him more a follower of that rare genius than an original master. To hold place among the men of second rate is, however, no mean tribute to his talent and ability. This talent, this ability, his severe studies under the most competent masters and by himself, his large acquaintance with ancient masterpieces, and with the best work of his own country, made him rarely fitted to form a judgment on every work of art. Time has not failed to establish this; for, while new researches have, not infrequently, corrected his facts, his judgments are still the judgments of the best. His mind was cultivated, open, appreciative not of any one art alone, nor of any one time, or school, or country, but of everything great and good. Michel-Angelo's design might be the greatest, but Giotto's art was beautiful, and Fra Angelico's showed not the hand of man, but rather that of saint or angel. From such a teacher, and only from such a teacher, can the beginner in art learn how to form that true taste which is based, not on the vain likings of the self-sufficient and uninstructed, but on the experienced judgment of the trained and thoughtful student.

The practical information, so requisite to the understanding of works of art, Vasari also gives us, and, in few and clear words. Half-a-dozen handbooks will not as well instruct us in approved methods in sculpture, technic in the various kinds of painting, processes of engraving, of modelling, or of casting. Rightly to appreciate art, we must know and appreciate the arts; and the arts, not only of one period, or of one country, but of all countries, and all times. No one knew this better than he whose busy life-record we have so hastily run over. As a help to this large view, he was careful to sketch out the history of ancient art. Archæology was in its infancy when Vasari wrote. We cannot expect from him the solid, detailed learning, or the painfully refined criticism, of the German of to-day; still, he gives the beginner all that is needful, and more than he might gain from more labored work. To complete his intelligent plan, Vasari not only reviewed the varying phases of the arts in Italy, but he also traced their growth in Germany and the Netherlands, and marked the mutual influences of the northern and the southern technic and ideals.

Critics who are taken up with questions about certainty of attribution, exactness of dates, and manufacture of impasto, may find satisfaction only in more modern and more soulless writers; but even these cannot advance one page without recurring to Vasari. He is, and will continue to be, the authority on the art of Italy

during its blooming-time. The book-makers of to-day but paraphrase him, more or less diffusely or succinctly.

Doubtless we cannot master art from one book, or from any number of books. The eye must be educated as well as the mind. Good things must be looked upon. But, rightly to see, we must know how to look and what to look for; and to know how to look and what to look for, we must have art in mind and eye. How is the eye to be trained? By looking on master-works. There shall we learn what beauty is.

It is not possible to know anything of art worth knowing, without a thorough acquaintance with the art of the past; nor to estimate the present good, or bad, without knowledge of the best. The inspection of miles of wall-space, hung with works of Millet, Diaz, Knaus, Bouguereau, Watts, and Meyer von Bremen, can never give us more than what they have of knowledge, or inform us of ideals, or expression, beyond their own. The viewing of pictures by popular painters makes neither lovers of art, nor knowers of art. These are made only by patient study of the best of every time and country, and by communion with great artistic souls. This communion Vasari's book affords, and, therefore, it is as fresh and useful to-day as on the day it first was printed.

Michel-Angelo, in his beautiful sonnet to Vasari, rightly estimated its purpose and its permanence:

"If with the chisel and the colors, thou
Hast made Art equal Nature, now thy hand
Hath e'en surpassed her, giving us her beauties
Rendered more beautiful. For with sage thought
Now hast thou set thyself to worthier toils,
And what was wanting still, hast now supplied,
In giving life to others; thus depriving
Her boast of its last claim to rise above thee.
Is there an age whose labors may not hope
To reach the highest point? Yet, by thy word
All gain the limit to their toils prescribed.
The else extinguished memories thus revived
To new and radiant life, by thee, shall now
Endure, with thine own fame, throughout all time."

PRIMITIVE MAN AND HIS SPEECH.

Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol. XVIII. Article "Philology." Part I.
Science of Language in General. By W. D. Whitney.

THE "Encyclopædia Britannica," of which the ninth edition is in process of publication, shows in its later volumes a somewhat closer approach towards that cosmopolitan or international character which, at the present day, is almost a requisite for any work of its kind. To make a cyclopædia the true exponent of contemporaneous learning, none but the leading minds of the age should be engaged for the treatment of at least all the more important subjects; and, surely, no single nation can lay claim to the possession of the foremost scholars in each branch of learning. How far a reasonable regard for unity and doctrinal soundness may be consistent with such a desire for the highest scholarship, is another question; for, as few will doubt, the progress of modern science has neither been very harmonious, nor invariably in a healthy direction. But, however this may be, in conformity with that international plan, the article on "Philology"—in the eighteenth volume of the British "Cyclopædia"—comes from the pen of two scholars of diverse nationality, and neither of them an Englishman;—the first part, on the science of language in general, being written by the veteran Sanscrit professor of Yale College, W. D. Whitney; the second, on the comparative philology of the Aryan languages, by Professor E. Sievers, formerly of Jena, now of Tübingen. It is upon the American contribution, as the more generally interesting, we propose to offer some remarks. Our highly esteemed countryman's treatise—as a matter of course, admirably written—deals largely with a problem that concerns not the philologist only, but also the philosopher, the historian, the theologian,—in fact, any serious inquirer into the nature and destiny of man. Professor Whitney has, heretofore, in several of his well-known publications on linguistic science, set forth the result of his inquiries into the same question more at length, and, perhaps, here and there, with some slight degree of diffidence; in the article to be reviewed he favors us with a shorter, but most unhesitating and categorical answer. Since, then, the solution of the problem, as therein presented, may be looked upon as the last word in the debate by a scholar of undisputed eminence in his branch, it will be well worth our while to consider his views with

all the attention due to so able a writer. The question referred to is this: How did man come into the possession of language?

Professor Whitney places the problem before us in a form that plainly forebodes the solution he arrives at. With him, the study of language is a division of the general science of anthropology, and the problem of anthropology is this: "How natural man has become cultivated man; how a being thus endowed by nature should have begun and carried on the processes of acquisition which have brought him to his present state." Now, language, according to our author, is one of those attainments that distinguish "man the child of nature" from "man the creature of education;" hence, the science of language must solve the question how man, "by implanted powers, directed by natural desires, and under the pressure of circumstances," has made, changed, and enriched his speech, until, from the first spoken sign, the first sound consciously and purposely uttered to signify conception, it has become that wonderfully rich and multiform body of expression which it is at the present day.

So much for the problem. As to the method of investigation, Mr. Whitney likewise draws the lines closely enough to secure a certain result to the exclusion of all others. "It is," he says, "by studying recent observable modes of acquisition, and transferring them, with due allowance for different circumstances, to the more primitive periods, that the question of first acquisition is to be solved, for language as for tools, for arts, for family and social organization, and the rest. For there is," he adds, "just as much and just as little reason for assuming miraculous interference and aid in one of these departments as in another."

After these preliminary remarks, the learned Professor proceeds to set forth the cause of language-making, which he shows to be simply the desire of communication. He then adverts to the analogy of the beginnings of speech with those of writing, the superiority of voice above all other instrumentalities of expression, and the imitative character of the first spoken signs. He further describes the progress of speech, from what he terms the spontaneous or arbitrary stage, to the traditional or conventional, and points out the peculiar character of human language as distinguished from "brute speech." After this he devotes a paragraph to the important statement that language, far from having played the part of a physical cause in the evolution of man's faculties, is but the necessary product of his natural endowment. He then enters upon the question as to the rate of progress made by man in the art of speaking, "after he came into being such as he now is, physically and intellectually." This question the Professor hesitates to answer, even conjecturally; yet he sees good reason to

hold that, as in other departments of culture, so in language, the very first items "were hardest to win, and cost most time, the rate of accumulation (as in the case of capital) increasing with the amount accumulated. Beyond all reasonable question, however," he continues, "there was a positively long period of purely imitative signs, and a longer one of mixed imitative and traditional ones." Having thus secured a speculative basis, the author enters upon the empirical and more strictly philological part of his treatise, and briefly reviews the diverse phases of language growth from the "root stage," and the exclusive use of signs denoting physical acts and qualities, up to the inflective forms represented by the most highly organized families of speech, and the accumulation of an immense stock of expressions for the most varied non-physical conceptions and relations.

All this is highly interesting and replete with evidences of stubborn study and keen observation; but—thus philosophic readers will be inclined to ask—has the distinguished philologist, ere he discusses the origin of man's speech, not a word to say on the origin of man himself? On this point Mr. Whitney peremptorily—though rather incidentally and later on in his treatise—declares that language has nothing to do with the question of the origin of man, "whether or not developed out of lower animal forms, intermediate to the anthropoid apes." And, in strict conformity with this declaration, he nowhere—in his larger treatises any more than in the article under review—directly or indirectly expresses his opinion on that great question. But since it is impossible to form a theory of the origin of language not in conflict with one or the other of the various opinions on the origin of man, our author by no means leaves us in the dark as to what he does not, or, at least cannot consistently, hold with respect to the latter question. His view is plainly, and at first sight, incompatible with at least one still rather widely accepted evolutionist hypothesis; with other scientific or philosophical theories it will, on closer inspection, be found to be equally, or almost equally, inconsistent; nor can it in any manner be reconciled with the doctrine of creation in the ordinary sense of the word. To show this will be the first part of our task; and if, as we fear, the result of our inquiry should be the strange fact that, whatever view we may take of the origin of man, Mr. Whitney's theory of the origin of language cannot logically be based on it; the next step will be to examine whatever evidences, intrinsic or circumstantial, the Professor may have put forth, or left us to infer, for the support of his view.

Man, then, whose first steps in the art of speaking our excellent author describes with considerable minuteness and absolute assurance, has,—so he tells us,—from the very beginning of his existence

as man, been the identical being he is now, that is, physically and mentally endowed as we are, though in a measure less cultivable, such as the offspring of less cultivated races are still found to be. But although possessed of all the innate faculties to which he owes his superiority over the brute creation, he was utterly destitute of any results of their exercise, including, of course, language. The human beings that began the making of language were exactly in the same position, both as to completeness of endowment and want of outward aid for the exercise of their faculties, as children growing up apart from society would be; or, to use the professor's own words, as "any number of human beings who should be cut off (if that were practicable) from all instruction by their fellows." How long that primitive period of muteness lasted, whether through a series of generations, or during a part of our first parents' lifetime only, Mr. Whitney does not explicitly tell us; but he declares, in his usual clear and direct manner, "that there was a time when all existing human beings were as destitute of language as the dog."

This is express enough; but let us see how that strange assumption agrees with the Professor's equally categorical declaration, that the question as to the origin of language has nothing to do with the problem of the origin of man. The singular condition in which he places primitive man is certainly not a fact of history. If it be a thesis to be inferred from other certain facts, or from demonstrable truths of science or philosophy, we look in vain for a direct proof in the treatise under review, or in any of the Professor's larger works. We must, then, be permitted to ask a number of questions, such as the following: How did the highly endowed, but still speechless, human beings of the period in question come into existence? Were they the offspring of others equally endowed, and equally destitute of language? And if so, how did the first in that series of privileged children of nature come into being? Were they created, or evolved? And if created, in the time-honored sense of the word, did they appear on earth with infantine brains, or those of adults? If evolved, was it specifically or individually? If specifically evolved, and consequently born of non-human parents, was it from beings far below them in endowment, or very nearly their equals, both as to innate faculties and favorable conditions for their exercise? If individually evolved, that is, not sprung from any parent organisms, but developed from a mere protoplasmic germ up to the perfect stature of man, physically and intellectually, which was their condition in the stage immediately preceding that of humanity? It will not do to discard these questions as idle or irrelevant. The degree of probability to be conceded to Mr. Whitney's assumption regarding the

condition of primitive man evidently depends on the answer; and since the learned philologist shirks the inquiry, we must, to the best of our ability, survey the solutions given by others to the problem of the method of man's first appearance upon this globe, as far as they may seem to bear on the question before us.

To begin with the least philosophical of theories, the Darwinian or Haeckelian hypothesis of descent, it would be the height of inconsistency for its upholders to assume a period of speechlessness, however short, in the life of fully developed man, such as Mr. Whitney supposes him to have been when he took the first step towards the acquisition of language. For, in the first place, it is impossible, under the exclusively mechanical view of evolution, to deny absolutely that even the "missing link," the simian ancestor of man, may already have made some feeble attempts at expressing such thought as he was capable of, by gesture, by grimace, and even by voice. But, be this as it may, the next link in the chain, man himself,—not Mr. Whitney's highly gifted child of nature, but Darwin's incipient man, slowly ripening towards perfection,—must have spoken through untold ages before he became our author's fully developed man; and, at that period, he must have acquired means for expressing thought by voice immensely superior to the most significant barking of the dog. For, according to the theory in question, the very acquisition of the peculiar physical and mental characteristics to which man owes the prerogative of speech, presupposes the long-continued actual exercise of those very endowments. Just as the differentiation of the nightingale's larynx, and the development of its musical talent, were conditioned by that songster's, or rather its slowly developing ancestors', twittering in the hearing of possibly the last gigantic saurians, so the development of man's intellectual powers, together with that of his vocal organs, implies his actual speaking far back in the primordial period during which he slowly advanced towards the full stature of man. In the struggle for existence, those nightingales propagated the species which not only happened—by slight variation—to be gifted with more developed larynxes and musical instincts, but also actually employed their melodious voices to attract mates; thus, in the incipient human species, those individuals gained the ascendancy, and perpetuated the race, who, chancing to become possessed of more differentiated cerebral lobes and vocal organs, also made the proper use of their corresponding accomplishments of mind and voice, be it to gain power over their fellows or favor with the opposite sex; and what other efficient use could they make of those faculties, save that of speaking, or, for all we know, even that of singing? The being, then, that was to become man, as he is now, must have been some sort of a speaker uncounted centuries

before he reached his full growth ; and no mean speaker at that stage of physical and intellectual maturity at which Mr. Whitney finds him at the outset of his career. But this the learned linguist positively denies, for there was a time when even fully developed man was "as destitute of language as the dog." The Darwinian hypothesis, then, is put out of court. Should it be true, then our author's linguistic theory is fatally sapped ; for the completeness of man's physical and mental equipment, at the period of the invention of speech, is its very foundation.¹

In fact, Mr. Whitney, notwithstanding his professed indifference, plainly enough, and very much to his credit, rejects the Darwinian hypothesis ; for, in the sequel of the very paragraph that begins with the denial of all connection between the two great problems, he also denies "that the making of language had anything whatever to do with making man what he is, as an animal species having a certain physical form and intellectual endowment." And farther on, supporting the assertion with some sort of evidence, he again says of man "that the acquisition of the first stumbling beginnings of a superior means of communication had no more influence to raise him from a simian to a human being than the present high culture and perfected speech of certain races have to lift them up to something more than human, and specifically different from the races of inferior culture." That the latter observation is as creditable to Mr. Whitney's good sense as it is in harmony with all known facts of anthropology or history, we need not remark ; but it is difficult to understand how the learned philologist could, with that conviction, fail to discover the intimate connection between at least one theory of the origin of man and the question as to the origin of language. But be this as it may, the fact remains that the Darwinian hypothesis of descent leaves no room for Professor Whitney's fundamental position.

The verdict will be the same if we examine another theory of evolution, apparently in better accord with our author's anthropological views—a theory that may recommend itself to minds less unphilosophical than Darwin's or Haeckel's, though still incapable of firmly grasping metaphysical truths. We refer to the hypothe-

¹ The above—it is hardly necessary to observe—is not intended to convey the idea that, on the Darwinian hypothesis, actual speaking was required as the *efficient* cause of the development of the human brain, larynx, etc. All we wish to assert and all that is required for our purpose is, that the actual use of those organs (by speaking) was necessary for their growth or differentiation *indirectly* or as *causa sine qua non*. There are, however, Darwinians who conceive language to have been a *working cause* in the process of man's intellectual development. Thus, the philologist of the Haeckelian school, Lazar Geiger, makes of language the mother of reason. One of our brute (irrational) ancestors, by a lucky accident, discovered speech ; and speech, as a matter of course, made man the rational being he is.

sis which admits final causes in the process of man's "phylogenetic"¹ development, but still denies all specific difference between him and the brute creation. According to this view, "some force conceived after the analogy of a rational impulse towards an end" (thus Mr. Huxley formulates the idea) has started and guided the evolution of the race, imparting to man, by a slow process of transformation, physical and mental characteristics different from those of the lower animals in degree, but not in kind.

The teleological, but still monistic, view—it must be remarked in passing—does not necessarily exclude the action of physical causes, such as casual variation, transmission by descent, survival of the fittest, sexual selection, and the rest. Accordingly, if these factors be considered necessary for the growth of man's faculties, actual speech is as indispensable a condition of his full development under this, as under the exclusively mechanical view of evolution. But, since Mr. Whitney holds that language had nothing at all to do with the development of man's faculties, we may limit our attention to that construction of the hypothesis under consideration which excludes—as far, at least, as the faculty of speech is concerned—Darwin's physical causes, and the question will be this: At which stage of man's physical and intellectual development did the production of language become possible? And if possible before the term of maturity, why should it not have been actualized? Was there any intrinsic necessity for man to reach his final grade of perfection before he could take the first step—"utterance with intent to signify"—towards the acquisition of language?

Presuming, with Mr. Whitney, the sufficiency of mere animal faculties for the production of human speech, it might still be contended that nothing less than the full wealth of endowment, as now possessed by man, was necessary for the successful elaboration of language. And against this, it might be argued that neither the undeveloped state of the infantine mind, nor the striking deficiencies of intellectually stunted individuals or of degraded savage races, are found to impede the acquisition and proper use, nay, even the enrichment, of language; and that, consequently, much less than the average endowment of man may have sufficed for the "first stumbling beginnings" in the art of speaking. But there is no need of arguing out the case on this or any other line. Our author himself relieves us of the burden. He plainly concedes the possibility of speech, similar though not equal to ours, at a grade of development far below that of man. For, to quote his own words, "if there once existed creatures above the ape and below man, who were extirpated by primitive man as his special rivals in the strug-

¹ *Phylogenetic*, relating to the evolution of the species; *ontogenetic*, relating to the evolution of the individual.

gle for existence, or became extinct in any other way, there is no difficulty in supposing them to have possessed forms of speech, more rudimentary and imperfect than ours." The conclusion is evident. If beings intermediate between man and the anthropoid apes may have spoken, man also may have been in the possession of some sort of language long before he attained to maturity. But Mr. Whitney knows with absolute certainty that there was a time when full-grown man was as destitute of language as the dog; and, if we understand him at all, it was impossible for man, at the outset of his career, to have been a speaker. The Professor does not say so in as many words; but as he does not even attempt to prove that the admitted possibility of speech in an earlier stage of development could not have been actualized, we must conclude that he considers our ancestors' speaking before their full development as an impossibility not worth the trouble of demonstration. But if man *cannot* have spoken before he was endowed as we are now, any theory of his origin according to which he *may* have spoken before that term, is inadmissible. Now, under the view of evolution here discussed, man—as Mr. Whitney indirectly admits—may have spoken in an earlier stage; hence, that hypothesis is as irreconcilable with his theory of the origin of language as the strictly mechanical view of evolution.

As far as we can see, there is but one theory of evolution which positively excludes the possibility of distinctly human or rational speech before the termination of man's (supposed) merely animal existence. That theory, it is true, maintains a specific difference between man and the brute creation, and, consequently, Mr. Whitney, who is wedded to the contrary opinion, cannot be presumed to hold it. But since our object is not to discover what the distinguished philologist does hold, but to show what he cannot consistently hold in regard to the problem of the origin of man, even this hypothesis calls for a short examination; and if it be found incompatible with the assumption of a period of absolute speechlessness in the life of primitive man, another possible prop will be removed from under the Professor's linguistic theory.

The hypothesis in question is a compromise between the peripatetic philosophy and modern biological science. According to it, the human organism evolved from a protoplasmic germ, produced by a supreme and all-powerful intelligence for that special purpose, and destined to pass through a series of transformations analogous to those observable in the embryonal or "ontogenetic" process, that is, in the evolution of the human individual. At each critical period of that process, a higher substantial, though transitory, "form," or psyche, took the place of the preceding one, and guided the further organic and psychical development of the nas-

cent species, thus bringing up the organism to higher and higher perfection, until a being was produced that lacked nothing but the rational soul to become human. At that highest and last stage, a psyche, endowed with the rational principle, and no longer transitory, but final, that is, destined to subsist through all future generations, was—at some stage of the embryonic development—imparted to its progeny, and *homo sapiens*, man endowed with reason, appeared on earth.

The question, for our purpose, will now be this: In which condition, as to utterance and communication by means of voice, were the immediate progenitors of man? Being still destitute of reason, they were, of course, incapable of rational speech; but equipped as they were with all, or almost all, that pertains to the organic nature of man, and a considerable part of what constitutes his psychical endowment, would these beings not give expression to their emotions in a manner vastly more human-like than any of the existing animal species are found to do? There is no difficulty in assuming them to have been in the possession of a form of utterance purely instinctive yet, and lacking, of course, every characteristic that presupposes the agency of the rational principle, but in other respects closely akin to human speech in the "root stage," and such as it would be if confined to the expression of sensuous emotions and conceptions. Provided, then, the immediate ancestors of man possessed such a form of utterance, what would have been the condition of their rational offspring in regard to the acquisition of language? If born with the linguistic instinct of their ancestors, they would, at the proper age, have instinctively spoken like them; if devoid of that instinct, they would have learned their parents' irrational language; but since their spiritual nature enabled them to speak in a specifically human manner, that is, with the conscious intent to signify, and to signify not merely sensuous emotions and conceptions, but abstract ideas, theirs would have been true language. And before they reached the adult age, the rational principle would probably have stamped its impress even on the form of their speech. But be this as it may, the only period during which, on this hypothesis, all human beings in existence were as destitute of language as the dog, would have been the early infancy of the first of our race. If this be all that Mr. Whitney understands by a period of speechlessness in the life of primitive man, the hypothesis in question will agree with his assumption, though in a very restricted sense only. For the first human children would have learned to speak exactly like those born at the present day. They would not have had to create language by the difficult and slow process described by him. We may, then, simply say that our

author cannot hold that hypothesis with any more consistency than those previously examined.¹

¹ The hypothesis discussed above is, perhaps, the most creditable effort made by *science* to account for the appearance of man upon earth. The learned Jesuit, Father Tilman Pesch, considers it as probably admissible from the mere philosophical point of view, or as far as the *questio juris* is concerned, while, on theological grounds chiefly, he rejects it. The following translation of the passage referring to the question will be found interesting. We quote from that Father's magnificent work, "Die Grossen Welträthsel Philosophie der Natur," vol. ii., p. 193.

"Was it impossible for the Creator—instead of forming the human organism immediately out of inorganic matter, as he has done *de facto*—to call into being a rational soul within an animal organism destined to become man? Could not the human organism have shaped itself in accordance with natural laws, by an inward principle of development? This question evidently transcends the assumptions of the mechanical monistic school; and it would probably be difficult to prove by cogent arguments the absolute necessity of immediate divine action for the production of the human organism; it would probably be difficult to demonstrate the absolute impossibility of natural agencies having been destined and empowered by God to develop gradually the human organism up to the degree of perfection requisite for the reception of a spiritual soul. We read in the Mosaic record that the Creator commissioned natural agencies with the production of *animal* and *vegetal* organisms. Why, then, it may be asked, should such agencies not have likewise sufficed to produce, in an analogous manner, the human organism, as far as its material side is concerned? Why should it be absolutely inconceivable that the Lord God called into existence, together with all other organisms, a purely animal organism, destined from the outset to develop, through a series of transformations, into the human organism? If such had been the case, the same thing, essentially, would have occurred in the case of the human organism that, according to the principles of the Aristotelian school, has actually taken place in the development of every existing human individual."

The learned Jesuit does not touch the linguistic problem in its relation to this hypothesis; but we need only assume the animal organism in question to have, in a superior degree and with due modifications, possessed those physical and psychical characteristics which enable the higher animals to instinctively use voice for the purpose of communication, and there will be no difficulty in conceiving a form of purely instinctive and sensuous, or emotional, but already articulate language. The great variety of sounds and tones produced by mammals and birds for the manifestation of the most diversified sensuous emotions, and understood and heeded by their fellows,—partially, also, by other species,—is known to every observer; and so is the close approach of some animal cries to the sounds of the human voice, a fact attested by the onomato-poetical names for certain beasts and birds found in all languages. On the other hand, there are, as every one knows, not even wanting species capable of mimicking articulate speech—to the end, one is almost tempted to say, of demonstrating the need of something besides highly differentiated organs for the production of true language. All this goes far to show how a merely animal organism could (without miraculous intervention, though not without teleological guidance) have been equipped in such a manner as to need but the infusion of the rational principle to become *speaking* man.

Having quoted what Father Pesch says in favor of the hypothesis in question, we cannot, without injustice, omit the learned Jesuit's remarks on the subject of creation, as considered from the philosophical point of view. He continues:

"Against such considerations the following objection may be made: 'Man steps into the visible world as a being pertaining to an essentially higher order. It may be conceived, no doubt, that the human *individual* be evolved from a purely animal immature form (larva), that has no other purpose in the system of nature save that of forming a transitional stage in the development of man. But if we suppose that a similar transformation from an animal organism into the human has taken place *phy-*

A moment's attention must yet be given to a theory devised, it would seem, for the purpose of reconciling, if such a thing be possible, the doctrine of creation with the evolutionistic tendencies of the age. According to it, the bodies of the first human beings were indeed evolved from protoplasm by natural agencies (teleologically guided), not, however, phylogenetically, but ontogenetically only, that is, instead of being the last offspring of a progressive series of ancestors, the first of our race came into being without the mediation of parent organisms, and attained to the stage immediately preceding that of humanity with a certain degree of rapidity and in a manner comparable, however distantly, to the passage of the butterfly through the transitional forms of the egg, the grub, and the chrysalis. Having reached that stage, they were—as in the last-examined hypothesis—endowed with rational souls by immediate divine action; or, rather, their “animal souls” were endowed with the gift of rationality.

But little need be said on the relation of Mr. Whitney's assumption to this theory. For, as far as the solution of the linguistic problem is concerned, it hardly differs from the one just examined, of which it is but a modification. Evidently, this mode of devel-

logenetically, then larvæ must have existed which, besides serving as transitional forms, had also to play the part of distinct species in the household of nature. From this it follows that from the admissibility of an *ontogenetic* animal origin of man, we may not at once infer the admissibility of an analogous *phylogenetic* origin. Attention must also be paid to the fact that man, as well as the animal or the plant, constitutes a unity (of body and soul). Now, as it is not repugnant that the animal, *notwithstanding* its psychical constituent, was produced by created causes, thus man can have been produced by immediate divine action only, *on account* of his psychical (spiritual) constituent. God, who created the soul, must at the same moment have formed the first human body. Nothing else would have suited the nature and dignity of man.' (Conf. S. Thomas, Summa Theol., I., q. 91, a. 2.)

“As for ourselves, we would not reject this view as untenable. Considerations well worthy of attention make it probable that but the immediate formation of the human body by God was perfectly congruous to the *nature* of man. For the very reason that man, by his *nature*, is superior to all other organic beings, it was, *in conformity with his nature*, allotted to him to be brought into being, not—like an animal—as a *part* of creation, but—as its *crown*—immediately by God.

“Should this conception be deemed less apposite, then it might simply be said that God bestowed upon man such immediate care in view of the *supernatural* destiny for which, as Christianity teaches us, he is created; and that, consequently, the revealed fact of the formation of the human body by God bears the character of an *exception* from the natural order, of something ‘supernatural,’ of a *miracle*. This view, too, might be supported by many considerations based upon the natural order, as well as on revelation.

“But, be that as it may, may it be believed that God, in His omnipotence and wisdom, had at His disposal still other methods of raising the human body to the summit of its perfection; may it even be asserted that, after the analogy of all other natural processes, the human body must needs have been evolved from an animal state, perhaps in the same manner as the human fœtus, according to the peripatetic philosophy, actually does. It is a most credibly attested fact that in reality, not man's soul only, but also his body, came immediately from the hand of the Creator.”

opment would merely have been an abridgement of the longer process of phylogenetic evolution, with the identical result—the production, on the last stage of organic evolution, of beings gifted with instinctive language materially akin to human speech, and but needing the action of the spiritual principle to become true language. Thus primitive man would have found himself at once, and still without miraculous interference, in the possession of a mode of communication immensely superior to the barking of the dog. That hypothesis, then, is as incompatible with our author's pivotal assumption as any other view of evolution.¹

There is but one short step from this last construction of the evolutionist hypothesis to the theory, or, rather, the doctrine of creation. And this is, as far as we can see, the only view of the method of man's appearance on earth that still remains to be examined. If not evolved, in some way or other, man must have

¹ To leave no room for objections on the score of completeness, the following *possible* construction of the evolutionist hypothesis may be included in our review of theories: The first of our race might have been the offspring of parents *far below* them in physical and intellectual endowment. What would have been their condition as to language? Born of a speechless, pitecoid mother, they would have been nursed and protected by her, as the founders of Rome by the she-wolf. This protection must have extended far beyond the term of parental care ordinarily bestowed by brutes on their progeny, or those helpless children would have perished. Thus, they would have learned from their mother and other simian companions all their accomplishments, including their apish jabbering, but no language.

Nothing, indeed, would seem to answer so well all the conditions in which Professor Whitney's children of nature found themselves placed at the outset of their career. Would they not have been obliged to invent the very beginnings of speech, including the simplest sounds of human language? Would their progress in the art of speaking not have been extremely slow?

The agreement is on the surface only. If you admit the possibility, in the specific evolution of organic beings, of a *saltus* as great as the one supposed in that wild theory, you are at once debarred from all right to lay down rules derived from *actual observation*, for the process of intellectual, social, or any other sort of development. The power that, for whatever reasons, would have enabled simian organisms of the supposed low grade of perfection to give birth to beings equipped with all the physical characteristics and intellectual endowments of man, must certainly have been able, and undoubtedly may have had reasons, to modify and shorten, in the case of the beings thus produced, the process of intellectual development also, and either provide them with some sort of rudimentary instinctive speech, or accelerate its acquisition, so as to make them accomplish in a few years what otherwise might have required ages. Children, you say, are not *now* born with instinctive speech. Neither are human children *now* born of apes. The primitive Aryan speech, you object, has not become Greek or English in a few years. Neither did the first fan-tails or "trumpeters" spring from the rock-pigeon in one generation; and what is the distance from rock-pigeons to fan-tails and trumpeters compared with the distance from the ape to man, whom you make the immediate offspring of the ape?

It is an all-important principle with Mr. Whitney that nothing has a right to be admitted as a factor in the first acquisition and the growth of language of which the action is not actually observable or demonstrable in recorded language. If he admits the evolutionistic view in question, that principle goes by the board. That theory, then, cannot be held by the Professor without the most glaring inconsistency.

sprung into being, such as he is, instantaneously, or quasi-instantaneously; he must have been created.

Now the creation of man, and the condition in which he came from the hand of the Creator, may be conceived in diverse ways. Let us first consider the mode presented in the text of the Mosaic record, as understood by Catholic interpreters.

Creation, in the strict sense of the word, is the bringing into existence of any substance, whether material or spiritual. In this sense the soul only of Adam was created; his body was formed from preëxisting matter. And so was that of the first woman; though in her case not merely a new combination, but also a miraculous growth of matter, would seem to have taken place. But let this be as it may, the shaping of both protoparents' bodies was not entrusted to natural agencies or second causes; and hence it is customary to apply the term "created" to their whole being, including the bodily organism and the "informing" soul. The first of our race, then, sprang into being in a state of maturity which, in the case of their descendants, is but the outcome of a slow process of development and exercise. They were not merely endowed, physically and intellectually, as we are, but from the first moment of their lives exercised their faculties of body and mind in a degree corresponding to the end of their existence in the state of probation, which was "to know, to love, and to serve God."

What, then, under this view, must have been the condition of primitive man in regard to language? He spoke at once. Even before a helpmate was given to Adam, he exercised the linguistic faculty—mentally, if not orally,—in his familiar converse with God, and certainly by actual utterance in his giving names to the living beings that surrounded him. And he spoke as never man has spoken since. His language, being in harmony with all other gifts showered upon him by his Maker, and befitting his exalted position, was one of unsurpassed fitness for the expression of thought. As his body was that of an adult, who would have passed in a perfect manner through the ordinary stages of development, including the exercise of the organs of sense and locomotion, so his mind was not a *tabula rasa*, but developed like that of an individual that would have been subject from infancy to a faultless training by master minds. For every idea, then, that existed in Adam's soul there was also given the corresponding linguistic expression. In what form of language he may have spoken, the monosyllabic, the agglutinative, the inflective, or some form different from all those now in existence, it would be idle, indeed, to investigate; nor will it ever be known to what extent his speech was affected by his fall. For our purpose it is enough to know

that Adam spoke, both before and after that fatal event. The doctrine of creation, then, as understood by orthodox ecclesiastical teachers, positively excludes a state of speechlessness in the life of primitive man.¹

There is, however, a view of creation that assumes—with what consistency we shall presently see—the absolute rudeness of the first human beings. The crude and hybrid theory we refer to was broached by some of the rationalistic theologians, chiefly Germans, of the last century, and may still be favored by a few, who, though averse to evolutionism in any of its forms, are yet unwilling to accept the biblical narrative as an exact record of the fact and the circumstances of creation. They admit the formation of the first human organisms by immediate divine action, but conceive the minds of the beings thus produced to have been *tabula rasa* in the strictest sense of the word. Endowed with all the innate faculties that belong to the intellectual nature of man, the first pair—or pairs, as some would have it—were still destitute of any of the results of their exercise—the very children of nature of Professor Whitney's anthropology. Let us, then, see how far that view of creation may agree with his fundamental supposition.

We may safely leave aside the possibility of the first men having been created in the shape of new-born infants or young children. The idea appears preposterous even to the school in question. They were, then, full-grown men and women. If so, they entered at once upon the task of forming a language. For "any human beings," our professor assures us, "that should be cut off from all instruction by their fellows, would *at once* proceed to recreate language;" that is, we presume, as soon as they reached the proper

¹ The above view, as to the state of Adam's mind, is set forth with great lucidity by Suarez (De Op. VI. Dierum et An. L. iii., c. 6, 9). "Certum est, Adam, statim ac fuit creatus, habuisse naturalem scientiam a Deo sibi inditam." "Scientia rerum naturalium Adamo indita in sua essentia fuit ejusdem speciei cum illa, quae inventionem et ratiocinio humano potest acquiri, i. e., fuit per accidens infusa, seu quoad modum supranaturalis, non per se et in sua entitate; adeoque Adam in ejus usu habebat, ut nos, dependentiam a phantasia, speculando ejus phantasmata; haec tamen erant in phantasia seu in sensu interno aut cogitatione a Deo infusa, uti et species intelligibiles, quae, licet non essent per sensus acceptae nec a phantasmatibus acquisitis abstractae, erant tamen tales, quales per sensus et phantasmata acquiruntur, i. e., infusae per accidens et in substantia naturales, sicut habitus scientiae Adami, atque ejusdem rationis cum illis, quae a phantasmatibus abstrahi potuissent."

Applying the same principle to Adam's speech, we would say: Any specimen of that language—supposing one having come down to us—would probably disclose to the practised eye of the philologist the same marks of growth which he discovers in all recorded speech, with none of its irregularities and blemishes, just as a chemical analysis of the wine served at Cana upon the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, would probably have shown all the ingredients and combinations of wine, grown and prepared by the usual slow process, with none of its impurities and defects. There was nothing supernatural in that language, though its mode of acquisition was different from all modes now observable. But more about this on another occasion.

age for the efficient use of those organs and faculties upon which the language-making power depends. Consequently, the parents of our race, being adults, began to speak on the first day of their existence. And imperfect though the first stumbling beginnings in the art of giving utterance to their thoughts may have been, their language, being human, was immensely in advance of all the means of expression in the power of the dog. The only period of speechlessness, then, in the life of primitive man, was the probably very short term between the moment of creation and the utterance of the first sound with conscious intent to signify. Still, even a minute, or a fraction of a minute, is "time;" and hence we are compelled to confess that one theory at least of the origin of man is not incompatible with Mr. Whitney's assumption.

But, however consistent with his views, can a theory so intrinsically inconsistent be considered admissible by a scholar of Mr. Whitney's penetration? We would do him an injustice were we to entertain the thought for a moment. If the Creator could call into being human bodies in an advanced state of development, it was certainly in His power to impart to them souls equally developed. And if there were reasons for Infinite Wisdom to dispense, in the case of the first men, with the natural laws of bodily growth, the same, if not stronger, reasons existed for an analogous dispensation in regard to their psychical development. The placing of infantine brains into the skulls of adults would presuppose a sort of retrograde course in the plan of creation, as uncalled for as would be a machinist's putting James Watt's tea kettle as a boiler into a three hundred horse-power engine. An adult human being, absolutely destitute of mental training and experience, would be a monster; and the ushering into the world of such a being, not an act of divine wisdom, but a folly, a miracle as aimless and unreasonable as the creation of an animal devoid of every instinct necessary for the preservation of its existence. And the life of man in that state would have been short indeed, especially in the case of the coexistence of any rivals in the struggle for life. A miraculous providence, of course, could have saved those miserable beings; but if the miraculous be at all admitted into our conception of the first beginnings of the human species, it is perfect folly to circumscribe the extent of that agency—to assign arbitrary limits to the Creative power, or to legislate for infinite wisdom.¹ The only consis-

¹ An almost ludicrous instance of the inconsistency into which the school in question is particularly liable to be betrayed, occurs in Jacob Grimm's (very interesting) essay on the origin of language (in *Abhandlungen der Koeniglichen Academie der Wissenschaften*, 1851). That eminent scholar counts among the reasons why more than one pair should have been created, the following: "The first mother might possibly have given birth to sons only, or to daughters only, thus rendering the propagation of the race impossible." The good old man graciously concedes to the

tent course is, either to reject the whole doctrine of creation, or to accept it as part and parcel of a supernatural revelation, with all its details; and, we may as well add, to understand those details as understood and proposed to our belief by the only authority in the world that claims assistance from above for the infallible interpretation of matters supernaturally revealed. Now, whatever be the final definition, by that authority (if ever to be issued), of the dogmatic truth as to the formation of the first human bodies, the Catholic doctrine concerning the protoparents' intellectual condition is definite; they never were in a state of absolute rudeness.

There is no room, then, in the doctrine of creation for the fully developed man destitute of language as the dog. There is, as we have seen, no solid foothold for that anomalous being in any of the divers constructions of the evolutionistic hypothesis. Unsustained by supernatural revelation, unsupported by science and philosophy, fully developed and still speechless man hovers before our sight, an airy phantom, a baseless vision, a puzzle infinitely more difficult of solution than the problem itself for whose disentanglement that condition of primitive man has been assumed by our author.

But perhaps our horizon is still too confined. Science has not yet said the last word on the question of our origin. The near future may solve the problem in a manner more consistent with Professor Whitney's conception of our primitive condition. In any event, in the present state of uncertainty as to the beginnings of our race, that problem must not be allowed to interfere with conclusions independently arrived at by means of sound philosophical considerations and linguistic facts properly interpreted. Are there such considerations and such facts amply sufficient to prove the invention and slow elaboration of language by fully developed man? Professor Whitney appears to think so. If we understand him rightly, the nature of language itself, all the observable modes of its acquisition and growth, and the very form of human speech in its earliest known stages, fully warrant the truth of his assumption. Our task, then, is not completed. A separate paper, however, will be required for the discussion of this and other questions connected with the inquiry into the origin of language.

Creator the power to call into being adults, and the wisdom to make them men and women, but (implicitly) denies his ability to determine the sex of their offspring.

The same scholar, to whom linguistic science owes so much, who was a child when he went "beyond his last," considers the "chimera" of an implanted language sufficiently refuted by the observation that it would have been contrary to divine justice to let the God-given speech of the first parents decline from its acme for the use of their less favored descendants. And almost in the same breath he acknowledges that whatever losses language may have suffered, they were in most cases, and almost at once, compensated by gains in other directions.

THE CHURCH IN CANADA UNDER THE FRENCH RÉGIME.

IT may seem unexpected that the subject of Establishments should have any special connection with a consideration of the Church in Canada. Such, however, will be found to be the fact,—indeed, to a thorough understanding of our subject, reference must be had to what was in reality a State Establishment in England, as well as to what was believed to be a State or National Church of France. At the risk of being tedious, it may, perhaps, be desirable to examine briefly how far the term “establishment” is applicable and appropriate to churches generally. A misconception in regard to this and some cognate matters has not only engendered a considerable amount of bad feeling in this country, but has given rise to prejudices and opinions which are positively unjust and unfounded, so far as Catholics are concerned. Mere individual opinion might go, as it has largely gone, for nothing. But it is otherwise with judicial determination. The judges of the judicial committee of the Privy Council in England, having before them every day questions bearing on their own State Church, may very naturally import corresponding impressions into the consideration of a case wherein the Catholic Church may be represented to be a State Church. They have assumed, for example, that during the French rule in Canada the Catholic Church was established by law; and that since 1763, when that country passed into the hands of the English, though it may not have been an establishment “in the full sense of the term, it nevertheless continued to be a Church recognized by the State.” It was one, therefore, over which the State could exercise some control. An establishment for non-Catholics generally is an institution over which the State presides, over which there might be a minister of public worship; and it presupposes a condition of things wherein the law could put an end to the establishment or to the parliamentary religion, just as the law created it. “The Anglican theologians,” says De Mais- tre, “often call their Church the Establishment, without perceiving that this single word annuls their religion.” The word in its usual acceptation is not used by Catholic writers regarding the Catholic Church.

The popular view of a State establishment becomes the more important to correct, inasmuch as one hears a good deal of a French National Church,—the “liberties” of the Gallican Church,—the

right to appeal from an ecclesiastical to a lay tribunal, commonly called the *appel comme d'abus*, and other matters now of some antiquity. Several industrious local writers, setting out with conclusions and adducing only such evidence as went in support of them, have discovered a National Catholic Church in Canada—an Established Church—a Church with the Gallican liberties (so they are called) of the Church of France, a royal as opposed to a Papal supremacy; and with much bemoaning these writers have adverted to the Ultramontane Church of the Vatican Council, under which for the first time Canada was brought under Rome, and the beloved national element put an end to. It is not likely that these gentlemen will change their opinions, even when these misconceptions are corrected; but it is due to those desiring to know the real state of affairs to have the truth put before them. The Catholic Church is not, and was not, and cannot be a national church in Canada or elsewhere; it cannot be "established" as is the church familiar to their lordships of the Privy Council; the supremacy of the Church is and has always been that of the Pope of Rome; and, finally, the Canadian Church was as ultramontane in the time of Louis XIV., and of the Popes who opposed him, as it was after the Vatican Council. It must needs be repeated very often in certain quarters that every Catholic is, so to speak, an ultramontane Catholic, and that whoever is not ultramontane is no Catholic.

The teaching of the Catholic Church on what lies at the foundation of this question of establishments may be found set out with great clearness in the famous Encyclical Letter, *Immortale Dei*, of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII., on "The Christian Constitution of States," dated the 1st November, 1885. After referring to the office of the Church in "watching and legislating for all that concerns religion, of teaching all nations, of extending as far as may be the borders of Christianity, and, in a word, of administering its affairs without let or hindrance, according to its own judgment," the Holy Father proceeds to show that the Church always claimed this authority from the time the Apostles maintained that God rather than man was to be obeyed. The Catholic belief on the relations of the Church and the State is thus expressed: "God, then, has divided the charge of the human race between two powers, viz., the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one being set over divine and the other over human things. Each is the greatest in its own kind; each has certain limits within which it is restricted, and there is, we may say, a world marked off as a field for the proper action of each. . . . So, then, there must needs be a certain orderly connection between these two powers, which may not unfairly be compared to the union with which soul and body are

united in man. What the nature of that union is, and what its extent, cannot otherwise be determined than, as we have said, by having regard to the nature of each power, and by taking account of the relative excellence and nobility of their ends; for one of them has for its proximate and chief aim the care of the goods of this world, the other the attainment of the goods of heaven that are eternal. Whatsoever, therefore, in human affairs is in a manner sacred; whatsoever pertains to the salvation of souls, or the worship of God, whether it be so in its own nature, or, on the other hand, is held to be so for the sake of the end to which it is referred, all this is in the power, and subject to the free disposition, of the Church; but all other things which are embraced in the civil and political order are rightly subject to the civil authority, since Jesus Christ has commanded that what is Cæsar's is to be paid to Cæsar, and what is God's to God."

If this ecclesiastical power is entrusted to the Catholic Church, and if she has charge of divine things as fully as the civil power has charge of human things, it follows that the Church has as good a claim—indeed the same claim—to the possession of her power as the State can show for its own. Whatever the extent of that power may be, it cannot, on the one hand, be lawfully abridged by a hostile civil power, or, on the other hand, be confirmed or more fully "established" by the action of a friendly civil power. The Church is entitled to this power, not by virtue of a mere human law, but independently of any human law, and if needs be, in spite of it. The Catholic Church, therefore, in a higher sense than that in which the word is generally used, is "established," but not established by any civil or human authority.

The Catholic Church never was and never can be "established by law," in the accepted meaning of the phrase, because a Church so established comes to mean one that depends on the laws of some particular State or country for its existence and support. It, therefore, at the best, can be no more than a State or National Church. It cannot be catholic,—it cannot be universal. As it may be established in a dozen different countries, it will necessarily be required to conform to the civil or municipal law of the land in each of these; and, therefore, it is in vain to expect that there should be unity, because there never was, and never will be, two countries in the world governed by the same local laws. If the civil or temporal affairs of the whole world were entrusted to some new Cæsar Augustus, and if the subjects of his authority undertook, in union with him, to "establish" the Catholic Church by means of an imperial edict, or act of parliament, that would mean, and mean only, the recognition of the Church to have charge

over spiritual affairs in its own legitimate sphere. This would still fall short of an establishment as popularly understood.

"The theory of established churches," says Cardinal Manning, "demands an ecclesiastical supremacy in the civil power. The two come and go together; and when the ecclesiastical supremacy is declining, the days of establishments are numbered. . . . A church that consents to be established at the cost of violating its divine constitution and its own conscience, is not a church, but an apostasy. No establishment by State laws and State support has ever been or can ever be accepted by the Catholic Church at the cost of its own divine constitution. The Catholic Church can stand, and has stood, for centuries in relations of amity with the civil powers of the world; but in the sense of establishments here understood, the Catholic Church has never been established in any kingdom upon earth."

Since the breaking up of Christendom in the sixteenth century, it is manifest that the phrase, "established by law," as applied to churches, must be restricted to national churches, or to such as are fostered or controlled by the will of any one sovereign people. But there is no longer a Christendom. When there was such, the Roman Pontiff was its head and the Catholic Church was its recognized Church. The temporal authority in each country naturally wanted, and sometimes imperatively required, particular regulations; and in this regard the Chief of Christendom, for the sake of peace or for other good and sufficient reasons, made special arrangements with that country—made concordats. In the Encyclical on Civil Government already referred to, it is said that "sometimes, however, circumstances arise when another method of concord is available for peace and liberty; we mean when princes and the Roman Pontiff come to an understanding concerning any particular matter. In such circumstances the Church gives singular proof of her maternal good-will, and is accustomed to exhibit the highest possible degree of generosity and indulgence."

Protestant writers, to whom the idea of a universal authority in spirituals, or a Catholic Church, is objectionable as affording a twofold argument against themselves and in favor of Catholicity (so to call the Church), have readily taken up the idea of national churches, either as the mere creation of the State, as Hobbes in his "*Leviathan*" has it, or as an organization for spiritual affairs coexistent with the civil government of the people, as is the more recent and less humiliating view. This theory, however, puts a church on a very temporal and precarious foothold and entirely at the mercy of the populace, who, as once before, might cry out for Barabbas, because the people, the king and Parliament in England, for example, could repeal the Act of Supremacy, could

declare the religion of the State to be anything or nothing, and wipe out the Church it had established; and do all that in a regular and constitutional way. Indeed, the days of the Church of England as a legal establishment are likely to be numbered, and may from constitutional, revolutionary, or external causes be completely annihilated. From a regular and compact Christendom we find there have been experiments with national churches; and now there is but one remaining step, from a few straggling and debilitated establishments to no church at all.

In the sixteenth century the English people achieved a separation from Christendom and established a national church. It was the ingenious theory of some of her historians that this national church is the original and genuine *Ecclesia Anglicana*, the Church whose rights were maintained inviolate in Magna Charta, and concerning which the repeated statutes of the Plantagenets form no inconsiderable portion of the legislation of the kingdom.¹ But it is undisputed that the Roman Pontiff had great control over the Church, that up to the time of Henry VIII. an appeal lay to him; that he had the right of nominations to vacant sees and to the heads of monastic institutions; that he confirmed all appointments of archbishops and bishops; and that a rupture between him and the king was the cause of the establishment of a national church of England and a separation from the Universal Church of Rome.

What took place in England is not pertinent to our subject, except in so far as reference is made to English church establishments. The abolition of appeals which Henry VIII. wanted, and the separation which finally resulted from his quarrel with the Pope, turned out to be two very different and, perhaps, unexpected things. But it is quite certain that other monarchs in Europe before and after his time were equally desirous, if not to nationalize the Church, at least to control it as much as possible. The history of Western Europe at the period we refer to is largely taken up

¹ This theory sits uneasily on the "Declaration of the Homily against Peril of Idolatry," put forth by authority of Queen Elizabeth in 1562, and approved of by the 35th Article of the Church of England. This describes the Church as fallen into the "pit of damnable idolatry, in which all the world, as it were drowned, continued until our age by the space of above eight hundred years, unspoken against in a manner." That was declared to be the case, "not only with the unlearned and simple, but the learned and wise; not the people only, but the bishops; not the sheep, but also the shepherds," etc. Rowland, a grave constitutional writer, says: "Our ancestors were certainly Roman Catholics," and then he goes on to resist the imputation that they were "Papists." If they were not "Papists," it is difficult to understand the statute respecting appeals to Rome, or Henry VIII.'s quarrel with the Pope.

In an article in the *British Quarterly Review* for January last, a writer on this subject says: "Whatever else the Reformation did, it gave to the sovereign that supremacy over the Church which was formerly held by the Bishop of Rome. . . . The bare fact from which we must start is, that the Bishop of Rome before the Reformation was supreme head of the Church in England."

with kingly encroachments on the power, spiritual and temporal, of the Papacy. Germany, Spain, France, might be considered as well as England. In the case of France, for example, we find concordats and pragmatic sanctions between the Roman Pontiffs and the kings, in order to come to an understanding on the particular matters of their nation. To say that because of these arrangements France or Spain had set up a national church, as happened in England, and had become independent of the Holy See, is what cannot be justified. Yet that lies at the foundation of an error within the consideration of so modern a subject as the status of the Church in Canada. The learned reader will withhold his decision as to the relevancy of some things here set out, which are well known, in order that the subject may be fully grasped. We hear of the Gallican Church, the liberties of the Gallican Church, and sometimes of the Gallican school of theology, until it is paralleled with the Anglican Church; and, finally, a grave bench of judges think that there is something in it, and what is more important, a grave question came near being decided in reference to all this. Writers in Canada have espoused this national church, and have given day and document for the transition from the Gallican Church of the past to the Ultramontane Church of our own day.

It is difficult to conceive nowadays the position the Catholic Church occupied in England in very early times, or even in times immediately prior to Henry VIII. The bishop's see at first was commensurate with a kingdom, the parish with a township. The bishop had then his own courts, and everything relating to the care of souls was to be adjudged therein. The law of these courts was the canon and episcopal law; and when the bishop excommunicated, the royal authority gave its full support towards carrying out the sentence.¹ The ecclesiastical courts decided all questions of wills, of legitimacy, and of marriage, and came very near absorbing all the litigation concerning contracts. Any man who could read might claim to have his case handed over to the ordinary,—the Bishop,—and so claim his "benefit of clergy." The wonder was that the king's court had anything to do. The king's council, or ultimate court, had no jurisdiction by a final appeal over these ecclesiastical courts; but an appeal, however, lay to Rome. Not only were the clergy possessed of their separate judicatures, in which they administered their own law, but they formed a separate order in the State. The Lords Spiritual were

¹ As long as the Convocation of the Established Church in the time of Henry VIII. had any power, things were not done so decently. The bishops could imprison on the mere charge of heresy, and when the cause came to trial the proceedings were in accordance with neither law nor justice.

selected from the ecclesiastical chiefs; they had their convocations in York and Canterbury, sitting regularly at the same time as the Commons, and being summoned with them. They, it is said, disputed the supreme legislative authority with the civil power in the State. They were in a majority among the peers, they had immense wealth, they were exempt from taxation. So far, then, from being a church "established by law," the Catholic Church in England was a separate, independent power in the State; and this position was accorded it by the oaths of kings and by repeated acts of Parliament. In upwards of twenty statutes during the Norman and English periods the "liberties" of the Church always appear. It claimed the sole right to define doctrines of faith and morals and to fix the limits of its own jurisdiction in that sphere. It taught that the civil power was to be obeyed in its own sphere; it was in union with, and subject to, the Popes of Rome. This was the Church of England in Catholic times, is the Church of the Vatican Council, and is the teaching of the Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the relation of the State to the Church at this very hour. This is ultramontaniam, and it is, and has been always, opposed to national churches or mere State establishments. "The Church in England, in Catholic times, was not established," says Cardinal Manning, "and when an establishment appeared it ceased being Catholic."

But Henry VIII. and his successors changed all this. The ecclesiastical courts are no more; their particular law is good only so far as it is not repugnant to the law of the land. Wills and matters testamentary are now looked after in the Probate Division of the High Court of Justice. Convocation is only a meeting for an adjournment. Some spiritual peers there are, but they sit as barons, the lowest of the five orders of nobility in the United Kingdom. The national church is not relatively to the State what the Church was in former times. Questions for the care of souls are now disposed of by lay, and not by ecclesiastical tribunals. The Church of itself has no authority.

The judicial committee of the Privy Council now decides what is, or what is not, heresy as opposed to the Thirty-nine Articles; and they are the judges of the legal tests of doctrine in the Church of England. These articles are rendered law and good religion by the statute 13 Elizabeth. And so the same judicial committee has decided on the canonicity of the books of the Old and the New Testament, the "real, active, objective presence" in the communion, as also the state of depravity sufficient to disentitle a communicant from receiving the communion. The manner of baptism has been defined by law, as well as all that is legal and salutary to believe so far as regards the same sacrament. The

communion table, the altar, the crosses, the candlesticks, the lighted candles, the vestments, the bread for the service, and many other kindred matters, are judicially laid down in English law as minutely as is the law of landlord and tenant. The legal posture of the clergyman has been carefully regulated. For instance, it has been held illegal for him in the celebration of the communion to elevate the elements above his head, or to mix water with the wine, or to use incense, or to kneel or prostrate himself before the elements. To bow one knee has been held a breach of the discipline of the Church; as also a practice of the minister to stand with his back to the people.¹ Decisions of this kind are not confined to the ones so well known as the Maconochie case, but numbers like it can be turned up in the law reports. This will give a fair idea of what is meant by a Protestant church as established by law in England.

How does all this compare with the Church of France—the Gallican Church? Louis XIV., it is true, had his differences with the Popes, but there was no such fatal quarrel with Rome as appears in English history. Relations, such as they were, often unsatisfactory to both parties, were maintained between the head of the Church and the head of the nation; but at no time did the parliaments or other civil tribunals profess to decide on the doctrine, the liturgy, or the discipline of the Church. The Catholic Church was no more an established church in France in the time of Louis XIV. than was the Catholic Church in England in the time of Edward III. Let us see how far it can be called a national church. From the time that Valentinian commanded the Gallican Church to submit to the Pope, down to the famous Articles of 1682, there is, on the face of French history, abundant evidence of the ultramontane or Papal, as opposed to the national or Gallican, character of the French Church. After she received the pallium from Rome, we have repeated pragmatic sanctions and concordats between the French kings and the Popes; for instance, the pragmatic sanction (now by many regarded as spurious) of Saint Louis in 1268, that agreed on at Bourges in 1438 with Charles VII., the concordat of 1515 between Francis I. and Leo X., abolishing this objectionable treaty with Charles VII.

The Gallican Church was, therefore, controlled to some extent by a power outside the French nation, and so was not national; it was ultramontane. These negotiations between France and the Holy See necessarily presume two things: 1st,—to use language not quite exact, but popular enough to be understood,—the dependency of the French Church on the Roman; 2d, privileges or

¹ See Moore's *Privy Council Cases*, New Series, vol. vii., page 167; vol. ii., page 375; vol. xv., page 1; *Weekly Reporter*, vol. xx., page 804; and *Jurist*, page 443.

concessions, liberties or slaveries, of the French Church, either towards the Roman Pontiff or towards the king. For the king, especially Louis XIV., used the influence of the Pope against the clergy, and availed himself of the clergy to make terms with the Pope. The French clergy were, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in a peculiar position as regards the king and the royal treasury. They were possessed of considerable means, and aided the king very materially in liquidating the burthens of his kingdom. They were in a position to ask favors, and the king, having conceded some, was similarly in a position to command their subjection. "It has always been a maxim of the French court," says Ranke, "that the papal power is to be restricted by means of the French clergy, and that the clergy, on the other hand, are to be kept in due limits by means of the papal power. But never did a prince hold his clergy in more absolute command than did Louis XIV. A spirit of submission without parallel is evinced in the addresses presented to him by that body on solemn occasions. . . . And certainly the clergy of France did support their king without scruple against the Pope. The declarations they published were from year to year increasingly decisive in favor of the royal authority. At length there assembled the Convocation of 1682. 'It was summoned and dissolved,' remarks the Venetian ambassador, 'at the convenience of the king's ministers, and was guided by their suggestions.' The four articles drawn up by this assembly have from that time been regarded as the manifesto of the Gallican immunities. It was the opinion of contemporaries that, although France might remain within the pale of the Catholic Church, it yet stood on the threshold, in readiness for stepping beyond it. The king exalted the propositions above named into a kind of 'Articles of Faith,' a symbolical book. All schools were to be regulated in conformity with these precepts; and no man could attain to a degree, either in the juridical or theological faculties, who did not swear to maintain them.

"But the Pope also was still possessed of a weapon. The authors of this declaration—the members of this assembly—were promoted and preferred by the king before all other candidates for episcopal offices; but Innocent refused to grant them spiritual institution.

"They might enjoy the revenues of those sees, but ordination they did not receive; nor could they venture to exercise one spiritual act of the episcopate."

The measures which Louis XIV. employed to coerce the Pope are matters of general history, and are detailed by Ranke, Gerin, Rohrbacher, and other historians. The king found it impolitic to have the Pope as his enemy, and place the Church to which he

himself and the French people were attached on the eve of what threatened to be a schism. Pope Innocent XI. remained firm, and so the king made a virtue out of his necessities, and went to the other extreme by his hostility towards the Huguenots. He withdrew from the position he had taken towards the Pope.

Ranke, after describing the change in the king, and the political complications of Western Europe that seemed to have driven him to it, proceeds thus :

"It is true that when this result ensued, Innocent XI. was no longer in existence ; but the first French ambassador who appeared in Rome after his death, 10th of August, 1689, renounced the right of asylum ; the deportment of the king was altered ; he restored Avignon, and entered into negotiations.

"And that was all the more needful, since the new Pope, Alexander VIII., however widely he may have departed from the austere example of his predecessor in other respects, adhered firmly to his principles as regarded the spiritual claims of the Church. Alexander proclaimed anew that the decrees of 1682 were vain and invalid, null and void, having no power to bind even when enforced by an oath. ' Day and night ' he declares that he thought of them ' with bitterness of heart, lifting his eyes to Heaven with tears and sighs.'

"After the early death of Alexander VIII., the French made all possible efforts to secure the choice of a Pontiff disposed to measures of peace and conciliation ; a purpose that was indeed effected on the elevation of Antonio Pignatelli, who assumed the tiara with the name of Innocent XII., on the 12th of July, 1691.

"But the Pope was not by any means more inclined to compromise the dignity of the Papal See than his predecessors had been, neither did there exist any pressing motive for his so doing, since Louis XIV. was supplied with the most serious and perilous occupation by the arms of the allies.

"The negotiations continued for two years. Innocent more than once rejected the formulas proposed to him by the clergy of France, and they were, in fact, compelled at length to declare that all measures discussed and resolved on, in the assembly of 1682, should be considered as not having been discussed or resolved on : ' Casting ourselves at the feet of your Holiness, we profess our unspeakable grief for what has been done.' It was not until they had made this unreserved recantation that Innocent accorded them canonical institution.

"Under these conditions only was peace restored. Louis XIV. wrote to the Pope that he retracted his edict relating to the four articles. Thus we perceive that the Roman See once more main-

tained her prerogatives, even though opposed by the most powerful of monarchs."

Ranke does not in any way question the authenticity or effect of the retraction. He then proceeds:

"The words of the king, in his letter to Innocent XII., dated Versailles, September 14th, 1693, are as follows:

" 'I have given the orders needful to the effect that those things should not have force which were contained in my edict of the 22d of March, 1682, relating to the declaration of the clergy of France, and to which I was compelled by past events, but that it should cease to be observed.' In a letter of the 7th of July, 1713, that we find in Artaud's "*Histoire du Pape Pie VII.*," 1836, tom. ii., p. 16, are the following words: 'It was falsely pretended to him [Clement XI.] that I have dissented from the engagement taken by the letter which I wrote to his predecessor; for I have not compelled any man to maintain the propositions of the clergy of France against his wish; but I could not justly prevent any of my subjects from uttering and maintaining their opinions on a subject regarding which they are at liberty to adopt either one side or the other.'"

This was the condition of Gallicanism in France when Canada was a French colony. The reader need not be detained with any account of the "liberties" (or "slaveries," as Catholic writers call them) of the French Church. They seem, at this distance of time, to resolve themselves chiefly into an annihilation of the Papal authority and an exaltation of the claims of the national clergy. The articles of 1682, some think, were the mildest expression of these liberties;¹ others consider them as the extreme limit of the kingly encroachments. The first, second, and fourth relate to the Pope and the Councils, and do not concern the subject here in hand. The third article assumes that the Papacy is inferior to the Episcopacy, and in France is subject to the rules, manners, customs, and institutions of the country. This subjection would, therefore, entail such courtly rights and exactions as the right of presentation, the right of the *régale*, the *appel comme d'abus*, and such other infringements of ecclesiastical power as the Court or the parliaments delighted to exercise. In the wilderness along the St. Lawrence, as Garneau in his History intimates, it would scarcely be expected that the courtly customs of the Gallican Church could have much application. The reader will appreciate, however, that in any discussion concerning the status of the Church in Canada, a reference to the Church of France may be most material. At the same time it is to be remembered that so far as "establishments" are concerned, the law of England is, that in any of her colonies the English Church is in the same situation as any other religious

¹ This seems to have been the opinion of Doctor Brownson.

body. After a colony has received legislative institutions, the crown has no prerogative to effect the least control over the colonial church; the mother church forms no part of the colonial constitution; and the establishment is not in any way transplanted. The position of the Anglican church, in a British colony, is that of a voluntary association.¹ If this analogy were insisted upon in a case where the French Church was transferred into a colony of France, one would hear less of "establishments" and "liberties" of the Catholic Church in Canada.

There are, therefore, establishments and establishments. A purely civil law that controls the doctrine and the discipline of a church, and manages its affairs just as it does the postal affairs or the customs of the kingdom, no doubt may establish a church or religion in a way that must be conceded to be legal and, probably, constitutional; but it is manifestly a different establishment from that of a church which has its own laws, its own courts, its own undisputed position as an integral part of the constitution; and whose authority and jurisdiction, if not superior to the civil law, are coördinate with it, and admittedly supreme within its own sphere. There is also that milder and uncomplimentary form of establishment of which the civil authority says in effect: We will recognize such or such a church as the established church of this country; just as it might say, we will do business in financial matters with the First National Bank. One cannot help remarking that those who aided in breaking up Christendom have taken low ground for their religions; avoiding a universal head, recourse was at first had to a national or royal supremacy, and after that has been found a failure, every man is and has the right to be the head of his own church. If the right of private judgment is good against the Pope, it ought to be good against the Privy Council. The historical fact is, that the world within a very short period has seen a Christendom with one international head; then national churches with a royal supremacy; and now disestablishment—no church. "The royal supremacy," says Cardinal Manning in one of his most happy remarks on this subject, "has perished by the law of mortality, which consumes all earthly things." It failed in Ireland—penal laws could not enforce it; in Scotland the whole people rose against it. In Canada,² after being shorn of many of its objectionable provisions, it was introduced by the Quebec Act of 1774. After several ineffectual attempts to enforce it, the provision passed through all possible stages of degradation; it was

¹ See *Long v. Gray* [Cape Town Bishop], 1 Moore's Cases, N. S., 411; *Colenso v. Gladstone*, 3 L. R. Eq., 1; *In re Bishop Natal*, 2 Moore's Cases, N. S., 115, deciding these points.

² See article on "The Quebec Act and the Church in Canada" in the October (1885) number of this REVIEW.

overlooked and waived and ignored, and then finally relegated to the limbo of obsolete law. During British rule in Canada, one thing is certain, that the Church of England never was, and is not now, an establishment by law; the Church of Rome, with its Papal supremacy, could not be expected to confine itself under a royal supremacy; it could not have acknowledged two inconsistent and irreconcilable authorities, and, therefore, it has not been an established church in Canada. It may well be the case that it is better known to the law of the land than any other church; that its freedom is guaranteed by treaty and by statute; and that the law of nations must be set at defiance before any abridgment of this freedom can be effected,—a strong and indestructible bulwark against bigotry emanating from any quarter;—but all this falls short of establishment even of the mild character alluded to. It is vastly better than the Establishment.

The Church under French rule must first of all be considered both with regard to the sequence of events and as throwing light on the state of affairs when this country passed into the hands of the English. It will be contended that it was no national or state church that formerly obtained in this country; that there was no transplanting of "liberties" of the French Church; and that from the historical evidences and legal state papers and other documents pertinent to the solution of these questions, it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusions.

From the discovery of Canada, or rather from the foundation of Quebec, the spiritual care of the French settlers and of the aborigines was entrusted to the Archbishop of Rouen. Quebec dates back to 1608, and is associated with the name of Champlain. Many other discoverers had touched at several points in the Gulf of St. Lawrence from the time of Jacques Cartier over seventy years before. To Poutrincourt is ascribed the honor of bringing the first missionary, in 1610, to this shore. As appears by the ecclesiastical records in Quebec, on the 12th of June, 1611, two Jesuit Fathers arrived from France to begin the work of implanting the faith in the New World. One of these remained about two years, and then returned to France. His *confrère*, after thirty-five years of missionary life, ended his days peacefully with the people he had come to serve. Not alone, however, during all this time; for in 1615, four Recollects reached Quebec, and every second or third year afterwards new missionaries of these orders reinforced their brethren, as death or other causes thinned their ranks.

The tenth name on the list is Jean de Brébeuf, a martyr in 1649. While not a few are set down as "drowned" or "frozen," there are over twenty on the same glorious roll with this illustrious Jesuit. Later, many are reported as lost—unheard of. In 1620

the Recollect convent was founded on the St. Croix River; the name was afterwards changed to St. Charles, and five years later the Jesuit establishment of Notre Dame des Anges. The year previous St. Joseph had been chosen patron saint of the country. In 1639 the Ursulines and Hospitallers commenced their labors at Sillery. Within this period is to be found the names of Lalemant and Brébeuf, Maise, Jogues, and other missionaries.

Shortly after Ville Marie (Montreal) was founded, and churches were built there as in Quebec. The Sulpicians arrived, and with them M. de Queylus in his quality as Grand Vicar of the Archbishop of Rouen. In 1658, however, Mgr. de Laval was named Bishop of *Petræa in part. infid.*, and Vicar Apostolic of New France, and the Grand Vicar retired from the country. It was not until 1674 that he was named Bishop of Quebec and immediate suffragan of the Holy See. This was by bull of Clement X., dated 1st of October of that year.

During these fifty years it may be fairly argued that whatever principles of the French national church or of Gallicanism could be imported into New France might have been so imported; that Quebec was ecclesiastically an outlying portion of the Archdiocese of Rouen, and that whatever that was, Quebec was. But now a bishop was to be appointed, and that was regarded then, as it may be now, the test question, or deciding whether Gallican or Ultramontane principles (so to call them) were to be transplanted into the French colony.

On this important matter few writers will be more readily accepted, at all events by Protestants, than the historian Parkman. In his "French Régime," he thus narrates this crisis of ecclesiastical affairs:

"Two great parties divided the Catholics of France—the Gallican, or national party, and the Ultramontane, or papal party. . . . Hence they claimed for him [the Pope] the right of nominating bishops in France. This had anciently been exercised by assemblies of the French clergy, but in the reign of Francis I. the king and the Pope had combined to wrest it from them by the Concordat of Bologna. Under this compact, which was still in force, the Pope appointed French bishops on the nomination of the king, a plan which displeased the Gallicans and did not satisfy the Ultramontanes.

"The Jesuits then, as now, were the most forcible exponents of ultramontane principles. . . . In the question of papal supremacy, as in most things else, Laval was of one mind with them.

"Those versed in such histories will not be surprised to learn that when he received the royal nomination, humility would not permit him to accept it; nor that, being urged, he at length

bowed in resignation, still protesting his unworthiness. Nevertheless, the royal nomination did not take effect. The Ultramontanes outflanked both the king and the Gallicans, and by adroit strategy made the new prelate completely a creature of the Papacy.

"Instead of appointing him Bishop of Quebec in accordance with the royal initiative, the Pope made him his Vicar Apostolic for Canada, a country of infidel savages, which was excluded from the concordat and under his [the Pope's] jurisdiction pure and simple. The Gallicans were enraged.

"The Archbishop of Rouen vainly opposed, and the parliaments of Rouen and of Paris vainly protested. The Papal party prevailed. The king, or, rather, Mazarin, gave his consent, subject to certain conditions, the chief of which was an oath of allegiance; and Laval, Grand Vicar Apostolic, decorated with the title of Bishop of Petraea, sailed for his wilderness diocese in the spring of 1659."¹

Slight reference need here be made to other facts which go to the support of this view. The unfortunate episode of Abbé Queylus made it only the more apparent that the "Papal party," as Parkman would call it, and not the "Gallican party," was at the head of the Church in Canada.

The Abbé had obtained bulls from Rome in regard to the curacy at Montreal. These disturbed the mind of the Vicar Apostolic, and he wrote to the Pope regarding the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Rouen. The result was not ambiguous.

"The Holy See annulled the obnoxious bulls; the Archbishop of Rouen renounced his claims, and Queylus found his position untenable. Seven years later, when Laval was on a visit to France, a reconciliation was brought about between them. The former Vicar of the Archbishop of Rouen made his submission to the Vicar of the Pope, and returned to Canada as a missionary. Laval's triumph was complete, to the joy of the Jesuits, silent, if not idle, spectators of the tedious quarrel."²

To Mgr. Laval must be ascribed the position of father of the Canadian Church. In 1663 he founded the seminary of Quebec, which was confirmed by letters patent from Louis XIV., and three years later he consecrated the parish church of Quebec. On the occasion of his visit to France in 1674, he was named Bishop of Quebec and immediate suffragan of the Holy See, and the reve-

¹ Abbé Faillon gives the documents in full.

² De Talon says: "L'Ecclésiastique est composé d'un Eveque, ayant le titre de Pêtrée, *in partibus infidelium*, et se servant du caractère et de l'autorité de Vicaire-Apostolique. . . . En lieu de soupçonner que la pratique, dans laquelle ils sont qui n'ont pas bien conformé à celle des Ecclésiastiques de l'Ancienne France, a pour but de partager l'autorité temporelle qui jusqu'au temps de l'arrivée des troupes du Roi en Canada, residait principalement en leur personnes." The extract made by Parkman is all that is material in these papers.

nues of the Abbey of Meaubec were united to the diocese of Quebec. In 1684 he established a chapter in his episcopal city, and four years later retired, leaving the Abbé de St. Valier as his successor. On the day after Mgr. Laval had retired, his successor was consecrated, though the bulls for his appointment and the letters patent confirming it had been issued some months prior to that time. These letters, issued in 1687, confirm the creation of the diocese of Quebec.

St. Valier had been Almoner to the king when Laval went to France for a successor in 1684, and it is ascribed to him that he tried to undo much of the good his predecessor had effected in opposing the kingly pretensions.¹ The mere fact of his being almoner suggests a favorite of the king; on him devolved the right of advising the crown as to the nomination to bishoprics. In 1685, two ordinances were passed which deserve to be noticed. In the commission to Denonville the religion of the governor is for the first time specially mentioned, it being required that he profess "*la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine.*" It is significant that Colbert died the preceding year. In March, 1685, an ordinance issued in which "*le roi veut y maintenir la discipline de l'Eglise catholique apostolique et romaine.*"

In 1695, during the episcopacy of St. Valier, the jurisdiction concerning ecclesiastical matters was thus defined: "*La connaissance des causes concernant les sacrements, les vœux de religion, l'office divin, la discipline ecclésiastique, et autres purement spirituelles, appartiendra aux juges d'église. Enjoignons à nos officiers et même à nos cours de parlements, de leur en laisser, et même de leur en renvoyer la connaissance, sans prendre aucune juridiction, ni connaissance des affaires de cette nature, si ce n'est qu'il y eut appel comme d'abus interjeté en nos dites cours, de quelques jugements, ordonnances ou procédures faites sur ce sujet, par les juges d'église, ou qu'il s'agit de succession, ou autres effets civils à l'occasion desquels on traiterait de l'état des personnes décédées ou de celui de leurs enfants.*"

On the death of St. Valier, in 1727, a question arose as to whom should be entrusted the conduct of his obsequies. Mgr. de Moray, some dozen years before that date, had been appointed coadjutor to Bishop St. Valier, under the title of Bishop of Eumenea in Phrygia. He had taken up his residence at Cambrai, and, as a matter of fact, never came to Canada. One of his first acts, however, after his succession to the See of Quebec, in May, 1728, was the nomination of Mgr. Dosquet as his coadjutor. On the death

¹ It is said that the aim of this bishop was to place the Church in Canada on the footing of the Church in France; but, as Parkman says on this, nature as well as Bishop Laval threw difficulties in the way. He effected nothing.

of St. Valier the Quebec chapter assembled and appointed M. Bollard as Vicar-General, in spite of the fact that Mgr. Mornay exercised that charge. A claim was put forward by M. de Lotbinière, as archdeacon, and a lengthy ordinance appeared under the direction of the intendant, Dupuy. He was a lawyer of the Gallican school, whose great ambition was to make the superior council at Quebec a reduced copy of the parliament at Paris.¹ With great prolixity, an ordinance of the 4th of January, 1728, prescribed the proceedings of the bishop's funeral. Two days later, a canon of the Cathedral caused a *mandement* to be read in all the churches protesting against this intervention of the civil power, whereupon the incensed intendant on the following day issued another ordinance which bears exactly on the question in hand. It is in the true Gallican spirit:

“L'Église étant dans l'État, et non l'État dans l'Église, faisant partie de l'État, sans lequel elle ne peut subister, les Écclesiastiques, d'ailleurs, étant si peu les maîtres de se soustraire un seul moment à la justice du Prince que Sa Majesté enjoint à ses Juges, par les Ordonnances du Royaume, de les y contraindre par la saisie de leurs revenus temporels, n'étant nécessaire, pour en convaincre tout

¹ As to the nature of the Parliament of Paris, hear what Count de Maistre says of it: “Protestant dans le seizième siècle, frondeur et Janséniste dans le dix-septième, philosophe enfin et républicain dans les dernières années de sa vie, trop souvent le Parlement s'est montré en contradiction avec les véritables maximes fondamentales de l'État. Le germe Calviniste nourri dans ce grand corps devint bien plus dangereux lorsque son essence changea de mom et s'appela Jansénisme. Alors les consciences étaient mises à l'aise par une hérésie qui disait: je n'existe pas; le venin atteignit même ces grands noms de la magistrature que les nations étrangères pouvaient envier à la France. Alors, toutes les erreurs, même les erreurs ennemies entre elles, étaient toujours d'accord contre la vérité, la nouvelle philosophie dans les parlements s'allia au Jansénisme contre Rome. Alors le Parlement devint en totalité un corps véritablement anti-catholique, et tel que sans l'instinct royal de la maison de Bourbon et sans l'influence aristocratique du clergé (il n'en avait plus d'autre) la France eût été conduite infailliblement à un schisme absolu.

“Encouragés par la faiblesse d'une souveraineté agonisante, les magistrats ne gardèrent plus de mesure: ils régentèrent les évêques, ils saisirent leur temporel; ils appelèrent comme d'abus d'un institut religieux devenu français depuis deux siècles, et le déclarèrent, de leur chef, anti-français, anti-social, et même impie, sans s'arrêter un instant devant un concile œcuménique qui l'avait déclaré pieux devant le souverain Pontife qui répétait la même décision devant l'Eglise Gallicane, enfin debout devant eux, et conjurant l'autorité royale d'empêcher cette funeste violation de tous les principes.

“Pour détruire un ordre célèbre ils s'appuyèrent d'un livre accusant qu'ils avaient fait fabriquer eux-mêmes et dont les auteurs eussent été condamnés aux galères sans difficulté dans tout pays où les juges n'auraient pas été complices. Ils firent brûler des mandements d'évêques, et même, si l'on ne m'a pas trompé, des bulles du Pape, par la main du bourreau. Changeant une lettre provinciale en dogme de l'Église et en loi de l'État, on les vit décider qu'il n'y avait point hérésie dans l'Église qui anathématisait cette hérésie: ils finirent par violer les tabernacles et en arracher l'Eucharistie pour l'envoyer au milieu de quatre balonnettes, chez le malade obstiné qui, ne pouvant la recevoir, avait la coupable audace de se la faire adjuger.”

le peuple de cette colonie, inviolablement attachée au culte dû a Dieu et à l'obéissance due au Roi par l'express commandement de Dieu, que de lui donner connaissance ainsi que nous allons le faire de la déclaration publique, que les *Evêques de France, assemblés à la tête du clergé, ont donné, le dix-neuf Mars de l'année mil six cent quatre-vingt deux*; laquelle déclaration porte en propres termes, que Saint Pierre et ses successeurs, Vicaires de Jesus Christ, et que toute l'Eglise même, n'ont reçu de puissance de Dieu que sur les choses spirituelles et qui concernent le salut, et non point sur les choses temporelles et civiles: Jésus Christ nous apprenant lui-même que son royaume n'est pas de ce monde, et, en un autre endroit, qu'il faut rendre a César ce qui est a César, et qu'il s'en faut tenir a ce précepte de l'Apotre Saint Paul, que toutes personnes soient soumises aux puissances des Rois, car il n'y a point de puissance qui ne vienne de Dieu, c'est pourquoi celui qui s'oppose à la puissance des souverains, résiste a l'ordre de Dieu dans les choses qui concernent le temporel.

"Ce sont ces vérités reconnues et annoncées par un clergé aussi auguste que l'est le clergé de France, dont les prélats et ecclésiastiques qui le composent, ont toute la science et la capacité convenable pour ne se point tromper eux-mêmes et ne point induire les peuples en erreur, aussi bien dans les affaires du gouvernement et de l'État que dans les plus grandes vérités de la religion, ce sont, disons-nous, ces principes qu'il convenait d'apprendre ici au peuple, plutôt que d'abuser de cette chaire de vérité où l'on ne doit prêcher que l'obéissance due à Dieu et au Roi, pour faire de la part des dits chanoines et chapitre un acte d'obéissance formelle à la puissance du roi et à l'autorité légitime; c'est donc pour aller au devant de ce désordre et mettre le conseil supérieur en état de punir les coupables que nous ordonnons qu'il sera informé contre le Sieur de Tounancourt, Chanoine de la Cathédrale, et autres, de la publication du prétendu mandement et manifeste, par devant le Sieur André de Leigne, Lieutenant-General, civil et criminel, en qualité de nôtre subdélégué à la requête du Sieur Hiche, que nous avons nommé en cela Procureur-Général de notre commission.

"Faisons de très-expresses inhibitions et défenses aux prétendus Vicaires-Generaux du Chapitre de Québec, d'envoyer le dit mandement et manifeste pour être publié en aucune Eglise de la colonie, sous peine de la saisie de leurs revenus temporels et autres peines de droit.

"Faisons pareillement défense aux curés et missionnaires des Eglises paroissiales du Canada de faire la publication du mandement et manifeste d'aucun autre qui émane des dits prétendus vicaires-généraux à qui le Conseil Supérieur a fait défense de prendre cette qualité et d'en faire les fonctions sous peine contre

les dits curés et missionnaires d'être déclarés désobéissants aux ordres du Roi et à justice et sous peine de la saisie du revenu temporel de leurs curés, etc."

If these ordinances of the council had taken effect, or had not been questioned, they would be strong evidence of the existence and toleration, the actual establishment indeed, of the "liberties" of the Gallican Church in Canada. But the governor, M. de Beauharnois, took the most decided stand against the action of the intendant, Dupuy; he annulled the obnoxious ordinance and had his own decrees for their reversal executed with the aid of the military. Cardinal Fleury, at home, had procured the dismissal of Dupuy; and although the governor may have acted in a high-handed way, as Mr. Garneau says, the ordinance of the 17th of September, annulling the proceedings of Dupuy, was confirmed by Maurepas, the French Secretary of State. Mr. Garneau thinks that the governor took sides more strongly in favor of the clergy than ever his predecessor took against them. But unquestionably it was a critical time in the history of the Church. Garneau's account is, to say the least, meagre, and not at all marked by the calmness that should pervade the treatment of such delicate subjects amongst his countrymen. Mr. Doutre is forced to say: "Le conseil se trouva ainsi en opposition au gouverneur et à la majorité du clergé. L'immoral Louis XV., de son côté, pour donner la change, se faisait servir par des cardinaux et donnait au clergé dans le royaume une immense influence. L'Intendant Dupuy, voyant défaillir le conseil, donna sa démission pour ne pas se voir retirer les faveurs du prince." This great and indisputable fact remains. In 1728, in La Nouvelle France, the declaration of 1682 was expressly referred to and relied upon in an official State document; and subsequently, within the same year, and as part of the same public affair, this document was officially, publicly, and with unusual notoriety, annulled and rendered void. The French authorities approved of this course.

The history of the declaration is in perfect accord with this view. It was never registered or put in force in Canada. This cannot be disputed. In the two large volumes compiled under the direction of the Parliament of Canada, in 1801, no such registration can be found; nay more, no official or other state paper from France has the most remote reference to it. It can be pretty confidently asserted that no official or other state paper in Canada, except the one already referred to as having been cancelled, is to be found. If not registered, then, according to the French law, it would be void. "It did not require registering," says Mr. Doutre, "because it did not emanate from the king." It is true that the declaration did not emanate from the king as a state paper,—it has been traced

pretty clearly to Colbert,—but the edict directing that the doctrines of the four propositions should be taught and maintained in the schools of the kingdom, was an edict emanating from the king. Mr. Doutre feels the weakness of a want of registration, however, and adds: “The most incontestable proof that it is possible to give that the bishops of New France are conformed to the declaration of 1682, is in the edict of installation of Mgr. Pontbriand.”

That admission, in view of what we have seen, will bring us safely down to 1714 without any Gallican liberties in Canada. Mr. Doutre is the great champion of the Gallican Church, and if there is anything in favor of his theory until Bishop Pontbriand's time, it is likely he made the most of it.

The See of Quebec was declared from its foundation to be immediately dependent on the Holy See. The claim of nomination was no special feature of the Gallican liberties, it was exercised in Europe in ancient times, and exists to-day.¹ Bishop Laval was no Gallican, and was opposed to Gallican principles; Bishop Saint Valier was necessarily something of a royalist, but was unable to nationalize the Church; he could not even establish an irremovable curé. We have seen the defeat of Gallicanism after his death—a defeat where success, if possible, was the most likely. During the episcopates of Mornay, Dosquet, and L'Aube-Rivière, there is no sign of any royal, or national, or Gallican tendency; but we are told that the installation of the last bishop under the French régime established the most “incontestable proof of the recognition of the four articles of 1682.” The first bishop was confessedly not within these articles, as his installation was many years before they were drawn up—the last one, it seems, is the only one possible to be accounted as Gallican.

Bishops in French times, and later under English sway, were royal counsellors as well as spiritual heads. They therefore took an oath such as privy counsellors at this day take. If Bishop

¹ Archbishop Spalding, in his *Miscellanea*, says: “Princes never had the right of nomination to bishoprics without the consent and concurrence of the Church. The thirtieth canon of those called Apostolic—believed by the learned to exhibit pretty accurately the discipline of the first three centuries of the Church—pronounced sentences of deposition against bishops who received their Sees from princes. The fourth canon of the great Council of Nice, held in 325, regulates the manner of appointing bishops by the prelates of the province, or by at least three of them, without even alluding to any right of the people or of princes in the matter. The twenty-second canon of the Eighth General Council, held in Constantinople in 870, goes still further and pronounces an anathema against any lay prince who would interfere in the “election or promotion of any patriarch, metropolitan, or bishop so as to prevent its canonical freedom.” Many other authorities could be produced to prove that the claim set up by the princes of the 11th century not only had no sanction from the Church, but was in the very face of all its rights and laws. By being liberal to the Church, temporal princes acquired no right to enslave it, and to introduce into its bosom the feudal on the ruins of the canon law.

Pontbriand, or any other bishop before or since his time, took an oath with any reference to Gallican liberties, or adverted even to the existence of such things, there would be an argument worth considering. Now, what are the facts about Bishop Pontbriand? After the king had seen the "bulls and apostolic provisions for the bishopric of Quebec," as the installation document says, "and not being able to discover anything in them, either derogating from our laws, indult, concession, and concordat between the Holy See and our kingdom, or from the privileges, franchises, and liberties of the French Church, we have admitted the said bishop to take an oath of fidelity that he owes us by reason of the said bishopric, as it appears by a certificate," etc.

Now all this is manifestly in favor of the view we are presenting. As to the bishopric of Quebec, the bulls and apostolic provision for its erection were issued on the 1st of October, 1674, and the negotiations for obtaining a bishopric for Canada began in 1657. The king wrote to the Pope frequently about it, and he was waiting, as the official documents show, until "il aura plû à notre Saint Père le Pape d'y en établir un."

Mgr. Laval was consecrated Bishop of Petræa in 1659, and the delay was really due to the fact, as Parkman tells, whether Laval should be attached to the Gallican archbishop of Rouen, or should be directly under the authority of the Pope. Between 1659 and 1674 Mgr. Laval was named Vicar Apostolic, which, as every one knows, is an office immediately depending on the Holy See. When the bulls were published in 1674, this fact was recited in them.

Now, in 1741, when Bishop Pontbriand received the mitre, he received it both with reference to the king and the Pope, exactly as did Bishop Laval in 1674; and this is not only the meaning, but the precise wording of the installation. Further, if the articles of 1682 were in force, either in France or in Canada, if no reference were made to them, it would be strange, but it might pass. When, however, the king says that "the bulls and apostolic provisions of the diocese of Quebec are in accord with the laws, indult, concession, and concordat" between France and the Holy See, it is inconsistent with these words to suppose the existence of the articles of 1682, which had been, as long as they were in force, directly opposed to the concordat of 1515, and to all the relations with the Holy See.¹

¹ The oath of Bishop Pontbriand is as follows: "Sire, Je, Henri-Marie Du Breil de Pontbriand, Evêque de Québec, jure le très-saint et sacré nom de Dieu et promets à Votre Majesté que je lui serai, tant que je vivrai, fidèle sujet et serviteur, que je procurerai de tout mon pouvoir le bien et le service de son Etat, que je ne me trouverai en aucun conseil, dessein, ni entreprise au préjudice d'eux, et que, s'il en vient

This document is, therefore, evidence against those who contend for the Gallican character of the Church in Canada; but even if it were the contrary, it has been referred to here for this reason: it is the only document in force referred to in the edicts, ordinances, *arrêts*, etc., in France or in Canada, in ecclesiastical or "Gallican" state papers, in which the phrase, "Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane," appears. The state paper drawn up by Dupuy in 1728, and already referred to, relies on the articles of 1682, but was annulled. In no one of the commissions to governors or intendants is there any reference to the Gallican Church. In the ordinances or patents respecting the bishops, the seminary, the Jesuits, or other religious bodies, there is not a word pointing to any Gallican Church or any special customs, liberties, or privileges.¹

The state papers drawn up in reference to the cession are further evidence of the position for which we are contending. The VIth article of the capitulation of Quebec provided that "la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine sera conservée;" the XXVIIth article of the Capitulation at Montreal makes provision that "la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine subistera en son entier," and then the Treaty of Paris in its IVth clause secures "la religion catholique . . . selon les rites de l'Eglise de Rome." Attorney-general Marriot, who went very minutely into the whole question, gave it as his strong opinion that the Church in Canada was the Church of Rome without any restrictions of the Gallican Church. He wrote at the time, and at the express request of the government of England. He was employed to draft a constitution for the "new" subjects of His Majesty George III., and he was regarded as one of the most learned doctors of the law in the kingdom.

The Church, then, in Canada began under the protection of the Archbishop of Rouen, and for nearly fifty years was under his charge. A vicar apostolic was then put over the country; the archbishop lost all control of the ecclesiastical affairs, and Quebec became immediately dependent on the Holy See. Prior to this time Cardinal Richelieu, an adherent of the Roman as opposed to the Gallican tenets, took charge of the colony.²

quelque chose à ma connaissance, je le ferai savoir à Votre Majesté; ainsi, Dieu me soit en aide, et ses Saints Evangiles par moi touchés."

[Signé] H. M. DU BREIL DE PONTBRIAND,
Evêque de Québec.

¹ In a series of questions put for the decision of the king in 1692, on some disciplinary matters as to precedence in the Church, an answer is given to one to the effect that the case be governed "par les usages de l'Eglise de France." It is needless to say that it would be unfair to draw a general deduction from phrases like "l'Eglise de France," or "l'Eglise Gallicane," when used in a sense of certain customs obtaining in France and necessarily introduced here.

² Ranke says: "Richelieu found it advisable, on the whole, to attach himself as closely as possible to the Papacy; in the disputes between the Roman and Gallican doctrines, he now adhered to the Roman and abandoned the Gallican tenets."

In the third quarter of the century the diocese was erected and placed under Roman as opposed to Gallican control. From 1682, the date of the Gallican articles, until 1693, when they were annulled, no edict is to be found transplanting them into Canada, and no French or Canadian edict ever referred to them as being in force in this country. The Pope, it is said, claimed that it did not apply to a country like Canada. The Superior Council at Quebec has no reference to it. In 1728 an attorney-general attempted to make it appear that it was French law, and founded an edict upon it, but the edict was annulled, and he was dismissed from his position. Finally, in 1741, the last bishop who owed allegiance to France was installed with special reference to the fact that the diocese of Quebec was created by the bulls and apostolic provisions of Clement X. in 1674. In 1763 Canada passed out of French control, and in the capitulation at Montreal, some years before, the French representatives asked that the nomination of French bishops, etc., be reserved to the French king, and the absurd request was very naturally refused.

The rights of the *régale* never could have any application to Canada except as to the presentation, which has been a law at all times in France—so long as the Church has existed there. How was this in Canada? Every bishop after Laval had his coadjutor, who was appointed *in partibus infidelium*, just as Laval himself originally had been. The consent of the king was superadded. There was never a vacancy in point of fact, and there were no revenues for the king to seize upon.¹ These are the three features of the *régale*, and it cannot be intelligently argued that the right applied to Canada. It did not arise in France until after 1670.

Then the *appel comme d'abus* does not apply to Canada. Sir Robert Phillimore, in giving judgment in the Guibord case, on the contention that the Court of Queen's Bench, created in 1794, possessed the power of enforcing the privileges of the Gallican Church by proceeding in the nature of an *appel comme d'abus*, says: "Considering the altered circumstances of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada, the non-existence of any recognized ecclesiastical courts in that province, such as those in France, which it was the office of an *appel comme d'abus* to control and keep within their jurisdiction, and the absence of any mention in the recent code of procedure for Lower Canada of such a proceeding, their lordships would feel considerable difficulty in affirming the latter of these

¹ The colony was so poor, and the church revenues so insufficient, that the king had to defray the expenses connected with procuring the bulls from Rome in Bishop Laval's time. When Canada fell into the hands of the English, the government granted an annuity to the bishop to maintain him in suitable dignity. A vacant benefice in Canada would not afford any *régale*. The bishops had the patronage by a royal arrêt, dated 27th March, 1699.

propositions." The ordinance of 1695, set out above, would seem to be decisive of this question.

In ordinary language, this means that there was no such appeal; that there cannot be an appeal where there is no court to be appealed from. His lordship then proceeded to show that a number of cases decided in Lower Canada, supposed to be appeals of this nature, were not so in reality. And one hundred years before this judgment of the Privy Council, Chief Justice Hey reported to the home government that so far as appeals from the ecclesiastical to the civil tribunals were concerned, "no such thing as ecclesiastical courts existed in the province." The governor-general, Carlton, acquiesced in this view. However it may be as to the existence of appealable courts, the position was taken that the tribunal capable of entertaining such appeals was not the Superior Council at Quebec, and this position was upheld on a reference to the French court. The ordinance of 1695, already cited, expressly enjoins that, except in the case of appeal to the courts of parliament, the civil authorities were not to interfere with the judges of the Church in matters of a spiritual nature. That the courts of the parliament of Paris might have been able to entertain an appeal, in virtue of this *ordonnance*, from the judges of the Church, may be fairly argued; but by every canon or legal construction of a written law, there could be no appeal to any other tribunal, and so no appeal to the Superior Council at Quebec.

In former articles of this REVIEW, the writer has discussed the "Treaty of Paris," and the "Quebec Act," making reference to such incidental matters as seemed to throw light upon these important documents. The order in which these studies have been presented to the reader may be open to some objection; but it is to be hoped that a little assistance has been given to whosoever takes up the task of writing the history of the Church in Canada. Such a work remains yet to be done; some general histories of Canada, of course, there are; but in these, even when written by Catholics, and where the Church necessarily forms an important part, much must be taken with caution, and not a little rejected altogether. It is to be regretted that, with one or two notable exceptions, non-Catholic writers have done themselves no credit by the suppression of what is unquestionably the truth, and by the suggestion of what is undeniably falsehood. It is no part of the present writer's task to correct, or to try to correct, every erroneous impression or unfair statement of those who have preceded him in the consideration of the questions here suggested; it was deemed sufficient to put forward the one view of the case and allow it to rest on such evidence as properly decides the questions in dispute. That evidence speaks for itself; and if the reader thinks it points to other conclusions, he is welcome to his own opinion.

CATHOLICITY IN ITALY.¹

A SINGLE fact, taken up by chance from among those which are of frequent and almost daily occurrence in Italy, and even in Rome, may serve to introduce to American readers the very important topic with which this paper deals. Yesterday—Septuagésima Sunday—at half-past one o'clock of the afternoon, a large and select audience assembled in the great hall of the Roman College, the once glorious school of the Society of Jesus, to hear a distinguished member of the Italian Parliament deliver a lecture on what must have seemed to his admirers a most interesting subject. Around the lecturer's chair was a circle of illustrious *Italianissime* gentlemen and ladies. There were Mancini, the ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs, who won himself such unenviable notoriety at the time of the obsequies of Pius IX., in the summer of 1881, and two years ago in the confiscation of the Propaganda property; Zanardelli, ex-Minister of Justice, Cairoli, Spaventa, Pianciani, Sbarbaro, Miceli, and others whose names the *Gazzetta d'Italia* omits to mention. The rest of the audience was made up of the anti-clerical clubs of Rome, of the youth who are mis-taught in the institutions which formerly composed the Papal University of the Sapienza and the Roman College itself, in papal times the Gregorian University.

The lecturer was the honorable Domenico Berti, and the subject was—The Life and Work of Giordano Bruno—the great apostle of atheism in Italy. The subject-matter and its treatment were quite in harmony with the ideas and sentiments of the audience, for the illustrious statesmen present, and the *moltissime signore*, the crowd of ladies, applauded frequently and vehemently.

So, in the great hall of the world-wide renowned Catholic school in which Leo XIII. was educated, he had the grief to learn that on

¹ [It may be noticed that here we present a second article, in this number of the REVIEW, on the relation of the State to the Church in Italy. The fact that these two contributions came to us almost simultaneously is a striking illustration of the renewed interest that is being taken in this question. Both papers were written in entire independence of each other, one by an American priest resident in the Eternal City; the other, by an American bishop, making close observation during his visit *ad limina apostolorum*, and, some considerable time after his return home, putting his recollections and impressions in the shape in which they appear in our opening article. Necessarily, both, to a great extent, cover the same ground; but each adds greatly to the interest the other awakens in the reader, who cannot fail to remark the different ways by which they arrive at practically the same conclusion. The Roman question will remain an open one until it is settled in favor of the Pope, of the Church, and of justice.—ED. REVIEW.]

Septuagesima Sunday, the beginning of the solemn penitential season, a high official held up to the admiration of the men and women of Italy, of the youth of Rome in particular, a man whose name would never have survived among posterity but for the evil preëminence gained him by his pestilential doctrines, his life dedicated to the propagation of blasphemy, and his evil end.

The *Syndaco*, or Mayor of Rome, Duke Leopold Torlonia, a nephew of the great Prince Alexander Torlonia, buried two weeks ago, not being able to preside at this ungodly assemblage on the Lord's day, sent one of his associates in office.

And so the Sabbath is now consecrated in Rome—in the name of Italy, of patriotism, of progress, of civilization—to the unhallowed work of undoing all that so many ages of Christian culture and piety had effected; of discrediting within sight of the hill where St. Peter was crucified, and of the great temple beneath whose dome he and his brother Apostle repose in death, the very doctrines which they had sealed with their blood, the very notion itself of a God Creator and Revealer!

But this is only a part of a system. Wherever in Italy there has existed in the past a personage noted for his hatred of the Papacy, or his prominence as a teacher of error, or a corrupter of souls by false doctrines or immoral writings, there it is now the rule, sanctioned by the men in power, to hold a solemn festival in honor of the man. So happened it with Arnold of Brescia, so with Socinus in Siena; so made they capital in 1866 of the centenary of Dante's birth to hold a carnival of anti-Papal exultation at Ravenna.

And why do we quote these facts? Simply to point to the clever and successful strategy followed in Italy and in Rome by the enemies of the Christian name to blot out from the souls and the lives of the people of Italy the last remnants of religious belief and practice, and to do their work so effectually that the reconversion of the Italian people to the belief in Christ and the practice of His religion will be a task incomparably more difficult than that which the disciples of Peter and Paul had to face on the morning following that memorable 29th of June, in the year of Christ 66, when Nero fancied he had killed Christianity with the sword which beheaded Paul, and made it eternally odious by the cross on which Peter died, head downwards, on the Janicule.

This is a grave assertion. But do you want seriously to become acquainted with the agencies which are now at work in Rome and throughout Italy to pervert the minds and hearts of her people? Do you wish to know what a plentiful harvest the enemy of God and man has reaped from the seed sown so plentifully and cultivated with such abundant force of laborers and such inexhaustible resources during the last thirty years or more? Then we shall

study together a few facts and figures whose eloquence and irresistible logic will need no comment of ours.

When we speak of "Catholicity in Italy," we mean, first of all, to show clearly, and beyond all possibility of gainsaying the truth of our statements, that the Catholic religion, *as such*, has suffered enormously during the interval just mentioned; more than that, the very basis of religious faith of any sort, the notion of a God, and that of any kind of *spiritual substance*, is being destroyed in the minds of all the youth of Italy—the immense majority—frequenting the public or government schools.

Of course, we, as Catholics, know on what Divine promises is founded our belief in the indestructibility of the Church, and the imperishable nature of the deposit of revealed truth committed to her. When, therefore, we speak of actual or probable decadence among any one people or in any one land, even in Italy, we are not to be understood as saying that Catholicity is in danger of perishing from the face of the earth. We simply mean to say that causes like to those which extinguished for centuries the Christian faith in Jerusalem and in Palestine, in Asia Minor and in Greece, all along the shores of Northern Africa from Alexandria to Tunis, and which almost obliterated Catholicity from Great Britain and portions of the European continent, are now at work in France and in Italy, aided by the experience of the past and the means of propagandism furnished by the present age. Will they succeed in effecting the same results? That we do not, cannot, say. The secret of the future belongs to the Eternal God.

We are only dealing with the present, and calculating what anti-Catholic and anti-Christian propagandism has accomplished within less than the last half-century.

The Catholic Church, as such, reposes on distinctive doctrines and institutions, without which she would be easily confounded with any of the denominations claiming to be called Christian and claiming even to be called "Catholic." We know that in the United States the Episcopal Church, in the British Empire the Church of England (and so of the Disestablished Church of Ireland), lays claim to Catholicity, with what little right we need not pause to show. So do the Jansenists of Holland; so did, within the last decade, the "Old Catholic" followers of Döllinger, whose church and pretensions have vanished like a short but evil dream. They sought fraternity with the "Catholic" or "Orthodox" churches of the East, and got more contempt than content from Greek, and Russian, and Nestorian.

But the Eastern as well as the Western pseudo-Catholics lack at least one essential condition of Catholicity—submission to and communion with the Chair of Peter, the Holy Roman Catholic

Church. This the Greek Church and her offshoots enjoyed before the Photian schism; this they tried to regain permanently in the fifteenth century, in the time of the Council of Florence. This submission and communion were again marred by prejudices and passions of race and country; and this, it is to be hoped, as the nations are brought into closer social and commercial intercourse, the Orthodox churches of the East will once more recover. Toward this reconciliation more than one great and successful step has been taken during the present Pontificate.

But, apart from the acknowledgment of the divinely established supremacy and infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiffs, successors of Peter, and from the necessity of communion with the See and Church of Rome, the Centre of Catholic Unity, the Protestants of Western Europe and the English-speaking world reject many of the doctrines which the Catholic Church teaches as necessary and belonging to Revealed Truth.

The Greek and several of the other Eastern churches have retained many of the institutions which the whole Catholic world regards as the necessary offspring of Catholic doctrine and practice, the feeders of Catholic life, the great agents and organs of the Church's life and action—such as the religious orders. Monasticism has ever held its ground in the East, vegetating within the limits assigned to it by the civil government or the local extension of each individual "orthodox" community, but, like each of these churches, having no expansive vitality of its own, no tendency to the Catholicity in space as well as in name.

The Protestant sects, in spite of a few sporadic and spasmodic efforts at organizing religious or monastic orders on the model of those belonging to the Catholic Church, have been, from their origin, too much opposed to them in principle, profession, and practice, to go heartily into the work of founding them or to find a hearty co-operation among their members.

So, confessedly, to confine ourselves to these two heads, the two great characteristic institutions of Catholicity in Italy, the Papacy and monastic life, have suffered from the anti-Christian revolution during the last forty years—during the period of Piedmontese usurpation, particularly,—all the loss and destruction which moral agencies and unscrupulous political might could inflict upon them.

What the Papacy has suffered and is still suffering at the hands of the present political rulers of Rome, it would seem perfectly needless to relate here. All Catholics are, or ought to be, familiar with the nature of the wrong done to the Vicar of Christ, with its enormity, and with its extent. But all are not; and among Catholics, even professedly good Catholics, or who believe themselves such, there are not a few who, before the entry of the Piedmontese

into Rome, went with the current of popular and anti-Catholic prejudice, and hesitated not to declare that the abolition of the Pope's temporal sovereignty would be a blessing—relieving the Church in every land of the constant reproach cast on Catholics about the scandalous mal-administration of the Roman States, and the seeming contradiction between the state, the pomp, the extravagance of the Roman court, and the simplicity, the poverty, the self-denial, the freedom from all worldly and political care, which became the sacred character and ministry of the successor of Peter, the poor fisherman of Galilee, of the imitator and follower of Paul, the tent-maker, who worked with his own hands to earn his bread and the bread of his associates in the Apostleship.

Who among us that has not heard such sentiments uttered again and again?

And since Victor Emmanuel took possession of the Quirinal and planted his sentries outside the very threshold of the Vatican, have we not heard it frequently said—do we not hear it still—that Rome is just as well governed as under the Popes, and that inside and outside the once Papal States religion is no worse off than before, and that the people are infinitely better off?

Never was error greater; never was illusion less pardonable in men who care anything for what is most vital in their religion, or who would not like to be called ignorant of facts the most obvious and important.

It is vital to the interests of the entire Catholic world, of the entire civilized world, that the Papacy, being what it claims to be, has ever shown itself to be, what it is still and ever must be, the living, abiding, imperishable embodiment of Christ, teaching, governing, leading the human race to eternal life, that it should be free—absolutely, visibly, confessedly free to fulfil its divine mission, able and free to provide the means to carry it on efficiently, secured by the will of all and in the interest of all, to suffer no curtailment of these necessary means, no obstacle imposed by a superior earthly power in the use of these means, or the discharge of an office which is identical with that of Christ Himself on earth.

It is childish to compare the conditions, the exigencies, the labors, and wide, universal action of the Pontificate, when looked up to and depended upon for light and guidance and all manner of spiritual support and comfort by *two hundred or three hundred millions* of Catholics, to the feeble beginnings of the Christian society under Nero. Peter and Paul, and their fellow-Apostles, went by order of the Master to preach the Gospel to the poor, to descend to the level of the sore and bruised of heart, of the slave and the oppressed, and the despairing of every clime, and to heal their wounded spirit by the unction of Christ crucified. Through

them they were to leaven the oppressing and ruling classes, and the whole mass of that idolatrous, sensuous, heathen world. The noble convert, Philemon, to whom Paul addressed from the Mamertine prison his exquisitely touching epistle in favor of the converted slave, Onesimus, was the representative type of the Roman, the civilized world, to be brought to the feet of Christ, just as Onesimus, who had been so useful to the Apostle in his need, and had helped him in his ministry, was the type of that glorious world of laboring men, workingmen, whom the Apostles and their successors were lifting up, enlightening, sanctifying, and employing to convert their masters and to change the face of the earth.

"Though I have much confidence in Christ Jesus to command thee that which is to the purpose, for charity sake I rather beseech thee, whereas thou art such an one, as Paul an old man, and now a prisoner also of Jesus Christ,—I beseech thee for my son whom I have begotten in my bonds, Onesimus. . . . Do thou receive him as my own bowels,"—as my own heart, we might translate it.

Oh, beautiful and sublime! But when the Neros had spent their rage and run their course and been cast, an object of pity or abhorrence on the stairs of the Gemonial, outside the Mamertine, and when emperors and empire were Christian; and when the civilized world claimed the care of the successors of Peter; when within and beyond the boundaries of the empire a new world had arisen, and was widening, widening ever, created by the zeal of the Pontificate, and its kingdoms with their rulers and peoples all claiming the care of him who sat in Rome on the Chair of Peter, by the Tomb of the Apostles on the Vatican,—surely the Pontiff on whom fell the burthen of this world-wide administration must be free to receive in his home on the Vatican all who came to him,—and all had a right to come,—and free to send to them, to go to the ends of the earth, men who represented his supreme authority, his fatherly care, the unbounded charity of Christ. Surely such an authority, unique in its kind on earth, because in very truth that of Christ, of God Himself, must be supremely free, *and free in Rome*, the divinely appointed seat of authority, unity, government in the Church.

And being supreme, universal, œcumenical in its character, its purpose, and institution, it must be SOVEREIGN, temporally as well as spiritually, in order to be free.

No living man, no power, no principality, should have the right to say to the Vicar of Christ: "Do this," or, "I forbid thee to do that," or "Sanction this law," or "Repeal that other law."

How long "under such hostile domination" as the present is

Leo XIII. or his successors to be allowed the use of the Vatican with its garden? How long are the archives of the whole Christian world, the records of Christendom in its relations with the See of Rome, to remain in the possession of the Sovereign Pontiffs? Napoleon I. took forcible possession of them, sent what he liked of them to Paris, and allowed his subordinates to pilfer and to destroy. The Italian triumvirate of 1848-'49 again had possession of them, and they took away and destroyed what it pleased them. We know how the garbled, mutilated, falsified acts relating to Galileo were thus carried away, and made up and published, to get up a case against the Papal tribunals and the Pontifical authority. Scholars know several other instances.

But the simple possibility of the guards of the Piedmontese King, or of the Radical Republic which is ready and waiting to gather his succession, entering the Vatican to-morrow, or next year, or in the near future, and possessing themselves of the last home of the common father of Christendom and humanity, of pillaging, ravaging, dispersing, or destroying the records of the Church our Mother, of profaning the manifold treasures which the hands and hearts of so many generations have accumulated there, only brings strikingly, vividly, home to us this great Catholic truth, that the Pope must be master in his own house, and, to be so, that he must be under the domination of no man, no people, no power; that he must be SOVEREIGN, temporally as well as spiritually.

But is he really not so? No! He does not descend to his own church of St. Peter's without running the risk of being insulted. He could not to-morrow go to officiate in his own cathedral church of St. John Lateran without creating such rioting in Rome as would cause disaster and bloodshed; as would imperil his own life, and that of his attendants and defenders. We in America, like all people far away from Rome, do not know the infernal spirit which the Revolution has evoked in Rome, and which walks its streets, and haunts its hovels, as well as its palaces, by night and by day, ready to rise at a signal and murder and profane!

So much about the *necessity* of the Pope's being really and truly, in every sense of the word, SOVEREIGN in Rome, Sovereign of Rome and of the temporal principality which the providential course of things, from the early ages onwards, created for the common parent of the Christian world, which the grateful consent of his own people and the international law of the entire civilized world guaranteed to him down to our own day; and which was wrested from him by means as iniquitous, by a treachery as foul, as any recorded in history.

Of course, the purpose of this paper is not to go into the titles of

the Papacy to the States taken from it in a time of peace by a power calling itself Catholic, and long and openly ambitious to be the sole master in Italy. The question simply is: Has the Piedmontese usurpation, and the consequent loss of all temporal power, been or not baneful to the Catholic religion in Italy? And, if baneful, how far has it been so?

Let us hear the present Pope himself on the subject. No man ever sat in the Chair of Peter more distinguished for moderation, wisdom, a thorough knowledge of men and of the times in which he lived, and that conciliatory temper which appeases rather than irritates. The golden opinions just won from all statesmen, diplomats, and publicists outside of Italy, by the prompt settlement of the Carolines or Pellew Islands difficulty, will give emphasis to our assertion. What, then, does the Pontiff, whom both hemispheres at this moment look up to with reverence, say upon the question to which we are seeking an answer?

In the Encyclical Letter *Etsi nos*, of February 15, 1882, addressed to the Italian hierarchy, Leo XIII. touches with his habitual tact and clearness the chief evils arising from the loss of his temporal sovereignty on the one side, and on the other the anti-Catholic, anti-Christian spirit of the government and legislation under which all Italy is suffering.

"We are compelled," he says, "to bestow peculiar thought and care on Italy. This thought and this care are inspired by something higher than mere human interests, by something far more divine. We are troubled and anxious about the salvation of immortal souls. Our solicitude and zeal for them are all the more intense and pressing that we see them exposed to the greatest dangers. And if ever at any time in Italy these dangers were truly formidable, they are especially so at the present moment, when the nature itself of the political institutions seems fraught with calamity to the very existence of religion. We are moved by the deepest concern in this matter, seeing what close ties bind us to Italy, in which God has placed the home of His Vicar, the seat of the great teaching authority in His Church, the Centre of Catholic unity. . . .

"A pernicious secret association, whose founders and leaders are no longer at pains to conceal or cloak their designs, has long been established in the Peninsula. They have declared themselves to be the enemies of Christ, and labor, therefore, to take away from the people all the institutions of Christianity. What success they have had so far we need not tell, since the havoc caused in the popular faith and morality is a thing obvious to all.

"Throughout all the populations of Italy, who have never wavered in their fidelity to the religion of their forefathers, the liberty of the Church has been annihilated; and more strenuous

efforts are daily made to blot out from all public institutions the Christian character, which has been at all times the honor of the Italian nation. The Religious Orders, with their houses, are suppressed, the property of the Church is sequestered, marriage is celebrated without any of the Catholic rites, and the youth of the country are brought up without religious instruction or control.

"To the bitter and deplorable war waged against the Holy See there is no term nor truce: this is to the Church a source of incredible trouble, to the Sovereign Pontiff a cause of supreme embarrassment. Despoiled of his civil sovereignty, he had to fall beneath the sway of a foreign power."

Surely, the case is plainly put. Many of us in America accept, on the present condition of the Papacy and the prospects of religion in Italy, only the account given by the revolutionary press of Italy, or by the English press, and certain American correspondents wholly in sympathy with the Piedmontese spoilers. But, if we know that our poor neighbor has been by some trick of the law, or by the influence of some wealthy and powerful enemy, stripped of house and land, we cannot be satisfied with what the unjust owner will tell us of the condition and prospects of the former proprietor and his family; we must listen to his statement, and believe it in preference to that of the wrong-doer.

Now hear what Leo XIII. says in that same Encyclical Letter about the condition of Rome—the home and city of the Popes—since it fell under the nefarious influences of the "secret association," in whose hands the Savoy dynasty are only convenient puppets for carrying on the process of decatholicizing, dechristianizing Rome and Italy.

"The City of Rome, the most august of all Christian cities, is open to the entry and assaults of all manner of enemies. She is profaned by novel rites, and beholds in her midst heretical schools and temples. Worse than this, this very year—they tell us—the delegates and leaders of the Secret Association, which is the sworn enemy of Catholicity, are to hold here a congress or solemn council. The reasons why they should have chosen to assemble here are plain enough: their hatred toward the Church can thereby be expressed more insultingly, for they will defy the Papacy in its very seat, and wave under our eyes the ensigns and emblems of their victory."

But the American public ought to know one fact among so many which appear incredible when first related;—in Rome, the acknowledged head of the Catholic religion until now, the civil authorities have absolutely forbidden the teaching of the Catechism in the primary schools, even in those taught by religious and supported by the government, and that when every child present there

is the child of Catholic parents! And in the upper schools not only is all religious instruction severely excluded, but every care is taken to secure teachers and professors whose opinions are openly and bitterly hostile to Catholicity.

In the meeting held in the Roman College on Septuagesima Sunday, mentioned at the beginning of this article, an incident occurred which throws great light on the kind of education given in the university schools here. That the Roman College should have been selected to celebrate an intellectual feast in honor of Giordano Bruno,—a celebration, by the way, boasted of by some of the organs of the sect, as one exclusively gotten up by the "Association,"—was evidence clear enough of the anti-Catholic character of the transformed institution at present, and of the training given therein to Roman and Italian youth. But, at the close of the lecture, a student of the name of Basso, in the name of an executive committee of his fellows, proposed that a monument should be erected in the Campo dei Fiori in honor of the apostate monk, Giordano Bruno, on the very spot where he was executed in punishment of his repeated acts of sedition and rebellion, and that a solemn assembly or congress should be held that day twelvemonth for the inauguration of this monument. As was to be expected, this double proposition was frantically applauded and accepted, not the least conspicuous in their enthusiasm being the *moltissime signore* present, they, too, being adepts or members of the "Association," ardent apostles of all the new doctrines and passions which are poisoning the national life in its well-springs.

And, be it remarked, while hatred of Catholicity, of the Papacy, of religious orders and the priesthood, is thus implanted in the minds and hearts of childhood and youth; while the Catholic Catechism is banished from every school in Rome, the Ministers of King Umberto, with Duke Torlonia and his town-councillors, bestow on the Waldenses, and on every non-Catholic sect attracted to Rome by hatred of the Papacy and the Church, not only the fullest liberty to teach their own Catechisms, to misrepresent and traduce before their young hearers the doctrines and practices of the Catholic religion, and to vilify the persons of its ministers, but the most positive encouragement to collect in their day-schools and Sunday-schools, by bribes in raiment and money, the children of the Catholic poor!

To be sure, Leo XIII. and his indefatigable, saintly, and eloquent Vicar-general, Cardinal Parocchi, are opening schools of every grade to counteract all these anti-Christian agencies. But they have against them all the influence, the resources, the authority of an unscrupulous government, aided by the most powerful organization for evil ever known in the history of the world.

And so the arch-enemy's work is carried successfully on in Rome!

Are the American, English and Scotch missionaries, who are spending so much money and wasting so much labor in "converting" Rome, never moved by any scruple of conscience with regard to their allies and auxiliaries? We are not questioning their convictions, or the sincerity of their zeal. But the preconceived hatred of the Pope and the Catholic Church should not blind them to the fact that the government which protects them, and the secret societies which work with them, have in view, not the triumph of the Bible, but the utter destruction of Christianity.

Hear again what the Holy Father says on this point :

"It seems incredible that such should be the design of men calling themselves Italians, and Italians devoted to the glory of their native land. For, if you take away from Italy the Catholic religion, you extinguish the chief source of her greatness. Much as she may have been, and was, to all other countries an unfailing benefactress, teaching their people the respect for law and the sacred immutability of justice, if her gentle power everywhere tamed the wild and headlong passions of men, if she associated herself with the citizens in the pursuit and enjoyment of everything that is honorable and great and glorious, if she bound together in perfect and lasting concord the orders in each State, and all the members of the commonwealth ; all this she did for Italy, but in a more effective manner and with a more lavish devotion."

The Pope continues in this strain to describe the special benefits conferred by the Papacy and the Church on the land it saved from the deluge of ills, brought on by the barbarian invasions, and then defended and protected from Saracen and Turk. He describes the institutions from which, through the Church, spring the order, well-being, prosperity, and greatness of states ; and then shows, by one or two graphic and powerful sketches, the social consequences of setting aside the authority, the teaching, the principles and practice of "Christian wisdom," as he so often terms Christian civilization in his magnificent encyclicals. The French Revolution and the short reign of the Paris Commune are instances illustrating what he is endeavoring to inculcate. And then he proceeds :

"If Italy has not, as yet, been a prey to a like reign of terror, we owe it, first, to a singular favor of God, and next we may assign as the reason that in Italy the immense majority having remained true to the Catholic faith, the criminal passions described above could not get the upper hand. If, however, the barriers which religion opposes to the inroads of evil be broken down, the torrent of ills which flooded and wasted other great and prosperous countries must sweep everything before it here also. Like doctrines

must lead to like results ; and, as the evil seeds sown are the same, so must they bear the same crop of evil fruits. Italy may even be still more terribly scourged, because to unbelief and impiety she would add the sin of enormous ingratitude.

" May God avert such fearful issue ! Still let all consider well the dangers already realized, or threatening in the near future, who, unmindful of the general welfare, seek only the success of their secret organizations, and display such fierce hostility toward the Church. Were they guided by wisdom, or by true love of country, they assuredly would not excite hatred toward the Church, nor abridge and destroy her liberty, nor allow themselves to be blindly led away by anti Christian prejudice. Instead of attacking Catholicity, they would defend and befriend it; above all, they would see to it that the Pope should enjoy his rights."

In another letter to the bishops of Italy, Leo XIII. again and again denounces the laws enacted by the Italian Parliament on matrimony, as well as the entire system of State education. As to the latter,—since we have already touched upon it, we may as well state at once, what everybody knows who is at all acquainted with the state of things in the Italian Peninsula, that not only is all religious instruction excluded from the public schools of every grade, from the University down to the State infant asylum, but they declare it to be their purpose to make these schools so many instruments for undoing all that Catholicity had effected in the past. The notorious Doctor Baccelli, when appointed Minister of Public Instruction, began at once openly, boldly, to carry out the scheme imposed on him and the government by their common masters of the " Secret Association,"—to make all instruction and education in the kingdom GODLESS. And he succeeded to his heart's content.

Of course you can calculate how long it will take, in any given country, to extinguish the last embers of religious faith, by the thorough and scientific working of a general net-work of schools of every degree, equipped with anti-Christian teachers and anti-Christian manuals of every kind, with a public press powerfully helping on the work of the teachers by daily lessons holding up to contempt, to hatred and to ridicule, all that past generations respected, revered, and worshiped ; and the same press flooding meanwhile the whole country with books of every size, with pamphlets, with publications suited to every purse and to every taste, exquisitely illustrated, so that even those who cannot read the text may not lose the lesson conveyed in the print ; and every one of these productions saturated with the deadliest soul-poison from the first page to the last, and every lesson conveyed in printed text, or by the finished skill of the engraver, teaching, in some one form or

other, contempt or hatred for the religion we Americans hold dearer than wealth, or honors, or life itself; all that subtly distilled and scientifically prepared poison killing in minds and hearts all reverence, all love for Him whom we have, for nineteen hundred years, held to be the God of our souls!

Is this a horrible dream, or is it a reality? But if a reality,—and, alas, it is,—to what a future it must lead!

But the education given in Rome and Italy by the Revolution, in the name of the House of Savoy, does not stop here. It is not enough to seize upon all the schools of a nation, and to organize and equip them, with the despotic and over-mastering energy of a power which recognizes neither a God in Heaven nor any moral authority upon earth; and to make this great educational organism work for one single, definite purpose, that of obliterating from the mind all religious notions,—should there happen to be any there,—and from the heart and life of childhood and youth all practical religious morality. The laws of Italy go further, the devices of the "Association" aim at something more: they take, by the conscription laws, the young man from his family and put him into the army or the navy for years. We are not speaking now of the terrible hardship and the no less awful expense entailed upon the people by this practice. It is only one of the crushing burthens imposed on the nation by the new order of things.

But neither in the army nor in the navy of the Italian Kingdom will these young sons of Catholic parents find any provision for their religious instruction and comfort, and facility for practising the duties of their faith. Living and dying, they are treated like the brute beast which perishes, which has no judgment to expect after death, no heaven to hope for, no hell to fear. Both army and navy are under the control of men high in the confidence of the "Association"—the dread, mysterious power behind the Ministers, the Parliament, and the Throne; the officers of every rank, as a general rule, are forced in self defence, if they would have any chance of promotion, to give in their adhesion; and no influence is spared to brevet as many of the men as possible. The whole atmosphere in which both professions live, is loaded with the poison of irreligious indifference, at best—with contempt and hatred for religion and its ministers, most frequently. How can these poor rustics, taken from the plough, from the religious simplicity of their homes, with their ignorance of the great, wicked world of city and army and navy, live several years in such an atmosphere, exposed to all the seductions of evil example, all the corrupting teachings of the new world into which they are brought, without religious control, or support, or direction,—how can they

return to their homes as they left them, the docile children of the Catholic faith?

Thus, the army and navy are two great schools, which carry on the work begun in the village school, if this—as is most often the case—is anti-Catholic, which begins and completes a counter-education, if that of the village school had been religious.

Add to all these perfectly organized systems of anti-Catholic education, the great army of officials in the various branches of the civil service. These are all, without a single exception, in the gift of the Ministers, and all bestowed, very naturally, on those only who support the government, and pledge themselves to promote the principles and the aims of the new masters of Italy.

In this education, given to the nation during more than a quarter of a century, the one great immediate purpose was to destroy the temporal power, as a first step toward the destruction of the Papacy. The Papacy still subsists in Italy and in Rome, with its uncertain seat in the Vatican. The Depretis government has shown, in more than one instance, that the Law of Guarantees, which professes to secure to the Pope the rank, rights, and revenues of a sovereign in Rome, cannot guarantee his dignity, as it did not that of his predecessor, against the power of the anti-clerical mob in Rome. We need only recall what happened when the remains of Pius IX., in 1881, were taken by night through the city to St. Lawrence's outside of the walls.

Most touching and eloquent was the remonstrance of the Holy Father in the Allocution delivered at the next Consistory. The savage inhumanity of the mob and the connivance of the government proved that the pretended sovereignty with its "guarantees" was a hollow sham.

As these pages are written a fierce parliamentary battle has begun in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, on the ruinous state of the Italian finances, with a deficit of over \$50,000,000, increasing yearly, while all productions are taxed to the utmost extremity, while the load of the farmer is intolerable, and the life of the laboring poor is not worth living. The fact is, that the great, powerful Radical party, the party of the near future, are clamoring for the downfall of the Depretis Ministry. Depretis and his associates, wonderful to say, are too conservative, too slow for these radical republicans, who are yearning only to realize the dream of Mazzini and Garibaldi,—an Italian republic without king or religion, without Church, or Pope, or priest.

The dream must become a reality before the present generation has passed away. And then what becomes of the Pope and the Vatican, and of all that remains of the great Catholic institutions? Providence is already paving the way for a return to better things.

Even should a sudden explosion of the anti-clerical hatred upset the dynasty throning in the Quirinal, and compel the flight from Rome of the Pope and the Cardinals,—it would be only a temporary calamity. Public opinion is growing in favor of the international character of the Papacy and its Civil Principality, and the day is not far distant when America as well as the Old World will interfere to secure Rome and the Vicar of Christ against such catastrophes as those which happened in the past and the one that threatens at this very moment. So the very extremity of evil will call for, and cause, an efficacious remedy.

But there are other evils which have fallen on Italian Catholics besides those we have been describing.

The bishops are in every way hampered in the fulfilment of the most essential duties of their episcopal office; and the priests are interfered with even within the church, even within the sanctuary, and at the very altar.

The prelates appointed to the vacant episcopal sees in Italy are refused the royal *exequatur*, that is, the official acknowledgment of their office, permission to take possession of the episcopal residence, and drawing their salary, or the miserable pittance at present allowed them by the government, after the seizure and confiscation of all church property and revenues. The Piedmontese government, as is notorious, set aside and violated in the most outrageous manner, without observing any of the usual forms of cancelling a treaty, every one of the solemn concordats and treaties entered into with the Holy See. It set itself in violent hostility toward the Holy See, after 1848, and passed law after law usurping the rights of the Church, trampling under foot her most sacred ordinances, and doing what none but the most bitter anti-Catholic could be supposed capable of doing. When Victor Emmanuel entered Rome, in October, 1870, crowning thus every former measure of sacrilege and usurpation, he at once assumed that the right of nomination to all the episcopal sees of Italy belonged to him, as if he were the heir to a long-established kingdom of Italy, between which and the Holy See there existed a concordat granting and securing the privilege of nomination. But no such concordat ever is established except between two friendly powers, and no such privilege of nomination is granted except to a friendly Catholic power. But Victor Emmanuel had repealed the Concordat existing between his own kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia and the Holy See; or, rather, he had torn it to pieces as so much waste paper. There had been no kingdom of Italy to which he could lay claim as rightful heir. The independent states of the Peninsula, like those of the Pope himself, had been usurped by the right of the mightiest and with the aid of the Revolution. He

could not set up the pretence that he inherited the rights guaranteed to the expelled sovereigns by any concordat. He could, above all, advance no such claim with regard to the States of the Church, whose sovereign had been the Pope himself. And yet he, the enemy and despoiler of the Pope and the Papacy, the enslaver of the Church wherever his arms prevailed, pretended that no bishop should take possession of his see without taking the oath of allegiance to the usurping sovereign of the Quirinal! We omit the other and consequent acts of oppression and vexation employed down to the present day against the Italian bishops, and which render their ministry in many respects a matter of the greatest difficulty. On the slightest pretext their salaries are withdrawn and their episcopal acts annulled, in so far at least as all outward effect is concerned.

The law obliging clerical students in the seminaries, priests of every rank, and even the rectors of parishes, to serve in the army, has, we need not inform the readers of the *REVIEW*, been rigidly enforced, and will be more so in the future. In more than one instance, the priest was seized on the altar by the agents of the public authority, stripped of his vestments, carried off to the barracks, and compelled to assume the military uniform. Is this to the advantage of Catholicity?

All this is well calculated to do away with reverence for the priestly office and character in the eyes of the people; to do away with any distinctive education and training for the priestly office itself; and to diminish by degrees and extinguish altogether the number of vocations to the priesthood. Thus, then, by usurping through the mere right given by resistless power, both the schools for educating the laity of every class, and to a very great extent the control of ecclesiastical education, the government has in its hands the two great founts from which flow Catholic life in Italy. We have just seen how they are planning to degrade the clerical and priestly character by the enforcement of the conscription laws, and by proceeding, step by step, to do away with any distinctive schools for training clerical students.

So, if no political revulsion intervenes to arrest their progress in this direction, vocations for the priesthood will go on decreasing in number with each successive year till they cease altogether. This lamentable decrease is already a subject of alarm and complaint to the French hierarchy; in Italy, both the Holy Father and the bishops have again and again solemnly proclaimed the existence and the magnitude of this new danger to the Church.

There is, in connection with this, another great source of Catholic life in Italy, another great nursery of apostolic zeal and priestly learning, which the government has doomed to utter and speedy

extinction: the religious orders of men and women, and, in Rome especially, the great parent establishments around the Chair of Peter, which fed and reared scholars, saints, and missionaries, ever ready to the hand of the Sovereign Pontiff for work of any kind on every point of the globe.

Superficial travellers,—Catholics even,—who visited Rome before 1870, complained of the extraordinary number of churches, convents, monasteries; of the multitudes of priests, and monks, and clerical students of every garb and nationality, to be seen everywhere. They forgot that Rome was, is, or ought ever to be, the great seat of Catholic learning, the great nursery of spiritual life, of missionary and apostolic zeal; that the Pope, as Vicar of Christ, is bound to labor unweariedly and as efficiently as ever he can, to rear up here men who are fit to go at his bidding to the ends of the earth, to be model laborers in the priestly office, model bishops in the episcopal chair, the light of the world wherever their lot is cast. Rome is—and all Italy ought to be, more or less,—something like a great permanent military camp, where the soldiers of the Lord of Hosts are carefully trained, under the eye of His Vicar, to fight successfully His battles among every tribe, in every land. Charity and mercy, and the prayerful contemplation which ever pleads at His Throne for the needs of the busy, toiling, surging crowds of the outside world, have, and ought to have, by right their nurseries and training-schools around the abode of Christ's Vicar. These are the mother-houses of the religious orders of women. They, too, train and prepare recruits for that other great army which has its battalions all over both hemispheres ministering to the bodily and spiritual wants of suffering humanity, training the women who are to be the Christian mothers of the coming generations, or lifting up their hands in prayer for a sinful world.

Rome is like no other city. It is the home of all Christians, of all humanity; for it is the home of the common father, teacher, and guide, appointed by the Creator and Redeemer of the race, Christ Jesus.

This has been, as this ever ought to be, the glory and the boast of Italy, which makes her the spiritual head of the world, and the centre to which all nations come, and from which Christian civilization radiates to every shore.

And the great crime, the unaccountable blindness of the men who rule Italy to-day, consists not only in their ignoring the immense, the incomparable moral influence of the Papacy, and the unique position providentially created for the City of the Popes,—but in their laboring to close and dry up in the churches, monasteries, convents, and other Catholic institutions of Rome, the very

fountain-head of Catholic life, the ever-flowing springs of civilization irrigating the whole earth.

They know what they are about, however. But Catholics, who do not understand the immense, the irreparable injury done to their religion, done to the entire human race by the suppression and destruction throughout Italy and in Rome of the monastic orders and their nurseries, must be either very ignorant or very unsteady in their faith.

We have said that in a Catholic country, like Italy, and in the very centre itself of Catholicity, the interference and anti-Christian legislation of the Piedmontese government followed the priest in his very ministrations within the church and within the sanctuary. We have mentioned instances of parish priests seized at the altar during the celebration of mass, and taken perforce away to the barracks to serve in the ranks. But the new law-givers of Italy went further. They prohibited even in the country places the solemn procession of Corpus Christi prescribed by the ritual and practised, to the delight and edification of the people, ever since the establishment of the feast of the Blessed Sacrament in the thirteenth century. Within the year last past, in the city of Rome and within the great court of the chancery palace, belonging to the Pope, the city authorities forbade the procession of the Blessed Sacrament! What would it be if, as before 1870, the procession was held in the square of St. Peter's, the Pope himself officiating? Protestants have described the solemn scene under Pius IX. as the most magnificent ever beheld on earth. It was the triumph of our EMMANUEL in the central sacrament of His love; it was the holiest, dearest rite in Catholic eyes, after the Divine Sacrifice itself; and the Pope dares not celebrate it within the precincts of the basilica of the Holy Apostles and of the great square designed and constructed to favor the sacred function!

But there is more than this. It is the real anti-Christian legislation on the Sacrament of Matrimony and its administration, as prescribed by the Church and her councils. The matter of the sacraments by divine right falls within the jurisdiction of the Church alone. In Christian marriage the very contract, or mutual consent, by which the parties pledge themselves for life to each other, is the essential matter of the Sacrament. Under the law of the Gospel, it is the duty and the province of the Church to see to it that the parties fulfil all the conditions required by Christ and by the Church herself. She has to see that both the man and the woman come to the performance of this contract with all the dispositions and conditions that may secure them the fullness of blessing and grace attached to the worthy performance of the contract, the pledging of their mutual consent, which, given in presence of

her minister or according to the forms she lays down for its validity, becomes, *ipso facto*, a Sacrament of the New Law, having its august type in the union of Christ with His Church.

To be sure, the State has a deep and vital interest, for the sake of families and the valid inheritance of property, and other causes, in the due and faithful observance of all the forms and rites prescribed by the Church in matrimonial matters. Therefore it is, for instance, that in Canada, where the old French law still holds, the registers of marriages, baptisms, and burials, authenticated by the bishop, are kept in duplicate; one register being kept in the parish archives, and one in the Prothonotary's office in the Court of Queen's Bench. This natural and reasonable interest and superintendence of the State the Church admits, wherever both powers, as it ought to be, agree with each other and act in concert to secure the interests of religion which are those of the State as well, the well-being of families, the peaceful and rightful transmission of property.

Such was the accord between the two powers which existed in every state in Italy before the year 1848. As the Piedmontese armies invaded state after state, till Rome herself fell into their power, the old laws and forms relating to matrimony were set aside. The revolutionary power would not recognize the divine right of the Church, universally acknowledged in Christendom before the "Reformation," over the matter and form of the Christian matrimonial contract, or Sacrament of Matrimony. Every man and woman who intend to contract such a union are bound under the severest penalties to apply to the civil authorities, and to be married by them. They may go to the parish priest afterward if they like. But one can imagine how, by degrees, all sorts of moral obstacles are put in the way of their doing so. And thus it becomes more and more the custom, in Italy as in France, to be satisfied with the civil marriage, and to have nothing to do with the priest.

This is not all. But should the parties dare to go to the priest first, and should he have imperative and most urgent reasons for blessing their union then and there, both he and the contracting parties are open to the severest penalties of the law.

Hence—not to go further into this matter—the sacred union of marriage, the foundation of the Christian family and the Christian home, as the family is itself the foundation of the State, is violently, sacrilegiously deprived by the new Italian laws of its holy character and the consecration of religion.

So marriage, the sacred fountain of family life; so education, the very root of the Christian State; so all that is most fundamental and vital in domestic and civil society, is thus made godless in the

new order inaugurated in Catholic Italy and in the capital of the Christian world.

With what results the intelligent reader may easily imagine. Let one man, whose venerable years, whose glorious services to Italy, whose sufferings for her cause, transcendent literary fame, and inflexible devotion to the Church and her pontiffs, have made his name dear to all scholars and all Catholics,—let Cesare Cantu tell us how far Catholicity has gained or lost by the Revolution and the suppression of the Temporal Power.

In a letter written to the author of this article on October 13th, 1884, he says:

“The information you give me on your own country is very precious. Good and evil are mixed up together with you, as in other lands. With your present population and your vast territory, your last year’s budget (expenses of government) was only \$240,000,000, while ours in Italy was \$300,000,000, a sum that compels them to crush us down with imposts. Thereby industry and agriculture are cramped. Money with you, I think, is to be had for 3 or 2 per cent. Here we get 5 or 6 per cent. for it. This is the reason why foreigners, Englishmen especially, are so eager to risk their money in Italian speculations.

“I am only speaking of northern and central Italy; for in the south interest is demanded at the usurious rates of 12 and 20 per cent., and even then one has no security. The low state of public morality in our country is a something incredible. There seems to be left no feeling of honor, of delicacy, of honesty. A long, long time must elapse before Italy becomes worthy of her destiny. One great obstacle is the war which is waged, openly or covertly, not only against Catholicity as an institution, but against the principles of Christianity itself. The question of the Temporal Power, unhappily, affords some reason for treating as the enemy of Italy a religion to which is due her chief greatness. The different Protestant sects are going to great expense to found establishments; they spend for that some eight or nine millions of francs annually. ‘This,’ says in concluding a report drawn up by one of their ministers, ‘is a great pecuniary resource for Italy.’ The government affords them all possible facility for their labors. It is in their favor that catechetical instruction has been banished from our elementary schools, as well as all religious acts connected therewith. For the crucifix and the portrait of the Pope they have substituted those of Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel. Baccelli, our Minister of Public Instruction, who shows himself all the more ardently hostile to Catholicity that he was formerly a subject and servant of the Pope, lately appointed a commission to choose school-books for the kingdom. One of the conditions imposed by these gentle-

men is, that no books shall be admitted which treat of any form of religion. Fortunately, people pay no heed to this rule. In Milan the Fröbelian establishments, the primary schools, and the infant schools begin with prayer, and teach the children their morning and evening prayers, church hymns, and catechism. So the little ones, even if prevented from going to mass, return to their homes after contracting the Christian habits which our rulers are fain to do away with.¹ . . .

"Just now again I am sent statistical tables which show, among other things, that from 1863 to 1883 suicides were reckoned by thousands. Our prisons are crowded with condemned criminals. Immorality is daily on the increase, and crimes are multiplying on every hand."

God knows how sincerely we desired that Italy, in pursuing and attaining the object of her aspirations after national unity, could have preferred federation to centralization! But Piedmontese ambition has ruined all.

¹ The Milanese Catholics have a good deal of the old Lombard spirit about them; it is sadly lacking in other cities of Italy.

LECTURES AND CATHOLIC LECTURE BUREAUS.

THE work of lecturing would seem to be assuming of late somewhat ample proportions. If to the degree of amplitude corresponds the degree of efficacy in spreading Catholic influence and thought, we think that the movement augurs well in the line of Catholic progress. Lectures are understood to be learned discourses. They may be written, but they are also to be spoken. They are not essays, which are only to be read. Nor are they quite what is meant by speeches. For speeches do not include that element of erudition which the title of lecture seems to guarantee. Perhaps it is owing to this element of learning in his address, that the lecturer not only by custom commits to paper the results of his researches, but is privileged by fashion to have his manuscript with him and before him.

The supreme value of spoken instructions, and of the spoken word generally, is a topic that has often been insisted upon; and we do not think that we could add anything, and enforce the logic of the position, either in theory or in practice. The nervous vitality of the spoken word may assuredly be left to defend itself even to the end of time. Yet there are not wanting artificial systems of theoretic or practical education, of religious or ethical instruction, which screen from view this evident principle, that man was meant to be instructed orally, by word of mouth; and that the written word on the printed page is at best a reminder, a memorandum, of subordinate use in the work of development. This is true in every order of development, literary, scientific, moral, and religious. Yet, in certain systems of education the text-book is allowed to grow like a fungus over the oral system of teaching in the primary and the grammar school. In certain denominations the written essay, read from the desk, has supplanted the whole function of the living word. And we know how, in the whole non-Catholic world which claims to be Christian, the dead printed page of God's Word in Holy Writ is made to bear the burden of all religious teaching and dogmatic affirmation, to the complete ignoring and extinction of oral tradition and of the Church's voice. And the consequences are such as we see, a gradual extinction of all religious affirmation, and a complete ignorance of Christian life.

In view of these and other considerations, we may be allowed to emphasize a little the privileges of the spoken word in our days and in our parts of the world. And this may be the more readily granted us, as we mean to make a passing allusion to an enterprise

upon which, here and there, Catholics are now embarking, and which we have named at the head of this article.

If there ever could be a real controversy between the spoken word and the written word, the question, such as it was, stood at a certain degree of controversial fervor several centuries before Christ. The state of the question then was, not merely about any extra degree of pleasantness in the spoken more than in the written word. This might evidently be admitted, that there was more pleasantness, more variety, more facility of understanding. The question was much more trenchant than that, when Socrates was arguing upon the subject with his friend Phædrus. It was simply whether the word when written was intelligible at all, unless it was first spoken, and heard as spoken, and understood as explained by him who spoke it; whether the written word was practically intelligible at all, unless the spoken word was beforehand in preoccupying the learner's mind; and, more than that, whether subsequently it continued to retain any value except as explained continually and interpreted by the traditional word, which "like a father," said the sage, has to defend the written page and to help it, since "it can neither defend nor help itself."

The whole passage of arms between Socrates and Phædrus is entertaining, and may be recounted here. The sage is telling his young friend a story. He says, the Egyptian god Thoth was the inventor of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, drafts and dice, and also of letters. With these inventions in his hand, the god approaches the king of Egypt, Thamous, and recommends him to make them known to the Egyptians. Thamous, however, is cautious; he does not take things unconditionally. He criticizes favorably or otherwise; and at last he comes to the letters of the alphabet. Ah! these, O King! says the god who invented them, will make your subjects wiser, and will improve their memory. Most ingenious Thoth! answers King Thamous, it is your fatherly affection for your own offspring that makes you talk of these letters so. Indeed they will neither improve the memory of my subjects, nor make their intellects wiser. Whoever uses your letters will rely on them instead of practising his memory. At best they are good only as reminders. Then, as to wisdom, your letters will make folks think themselves wise, without being at all so. They will think they know a great deal, while they have no judgment of their own to make their knowledge worth anything.

To this Phædrus replies: You are a great hand, Socrates, at telling stories from Egypt or any other country.

My dear Phædrus, answers the sage, do you know that, in times gone by, they made oracular responses come out of an oak? Men of olden time were not as wise as you young men. They

would listen to an oak or a rock, if only they could get the truth out of it. But you young gentlemen don't look for the truth. What you want to know is, who says it, and where was he born, and where does the story come from, not—is it true?

Phædrus submits to the rebuke. Socrates continues: The written word has one unfortunate characteristic about it, common to itself and to painting. Take a picture. It is life-like. But ask it a question; it is dumb. So is it with writing. You think that it speaks to you with some meaning. But ask now what that meaning is. Lo! there it stands with just the same word in its mouth. When once a thing is written it may be tossed over by all who read it, and it cannot say another word to explain itself, nor can it stop saying what it says. It knows neither how to speak nor how to be silent with the proper persons. And if you maltreat it or slander it, why, it must have its father come and help it, for it cannot defend or help itself. What is its father, what is its lawful brother, that knows how to defend itself and to defend the written word, that knows how to speak and to be silent with the proper persons? That is the spoken word engraving itself on the disciple's soul, with true knowledge; the spoken and animated word, whereof the written one is but a shadow.

My dear Phædrus, it is an earnest work in a high sense, when one, using the art of the living word, takes hold of fitting souls; and plants therein living words of true knowledge able to help themselves and their planter, words not fruitless, but having seed. And from that seed springs up a posterity of truthful minds, fit for immortality.

The plea for the spoken word, thus put forward by the great old philosopher of common sense, cannot fall under suspicion as having been specially conceived to condemn either private judgment in religion or the modern text-book in schools. Yet it condemns both, and many other things besides. The one point which it makes salient at all times and at all ages of life is communication by word of mouth. Not only "faith comes by hearing," but everything in the way of enlightenment must own a certain degree of indebtedness in the same direction. However, we must be more definite here.

Oral teaching, to use the term in any strict sense, is imparted either in the school-room or in the lecture hall. In the school-room it is not called lecturing; nor is any form of oral teaching, which is at all appropriate there, to be confused with the notion of what is properly a lecture. This is very evident if we speak of primary education. But in secondary education likewise, or what we mean by liberal studies, it is only slowly that the lecture begins to find a place. According as the mind of the student begins to

be independent, and to show the results of careful and stimulating development, according as the trained mind begins to possess some material of its own, and some initiative too, wherewith it can work on a hint given or kindle at a suggestion, does the function of lecturing first appear inceptively and tentatively upon the scene of his studies. And this is the point at which the student may now consider himself introduced to the studies of a university.

We do not intend to speak of the university lecture, although it is the only one strictly so called and in the full sense. It may be delivered from the pulpit; and then it is the sacred lecture. We mean to speak of the popular form, which no doubt was originally an outgrowth of the university. It was an indulgence in higher studies, brought out of the lecture hall, and brought down from the professor's chair, to elevate the busy thoughts and to refresh the thirsty souls of men deeply occupied outside. Whoever first made the lecture popular, and brought it out into the living, active world, may be credited with having accomplished the same work as Socrates in other days. He, says Cicero, called down philosophy from heaven to earth, and brought it into cities and houses, and made it modify life and shape manners, and try the good and evil of things. He assigned it a province of its own, very wide and very important. That was to move about amid the thoughts and actions of the daily practical man, and do there what religion should have done, if there had been a religion then to do it. But as there was then no religion worthy of the name, the work which had to be done with men's minds and hearts was attempted by the philosopher's lecture, or, rather, in the case of Socrates, by the philosopher's talk and catechism. This was the express profession subsequently of the philosophers down to Seneca and Epictetus; and it is an instructive fact. For to-day a large portion of the cultured world pretends to acknowledge no religion. Now, if the lecturer do not undertake in some part that work of religion, with the appliances and aids of positive truth and latent sentiment, which the old philosophers knew nothing of, the work of religion must remain unattempted and the pathway to faith remain for many a man practically unknown.

Though we are going to speak of the popular form of lecturing, yet before we leave the university and the professor's chair, there are several interesting lessons to be learnt from positive facts connected with that subject. One regards the habits of mind in an audience; the other regards the financial working of popular schemes.

As to the habits of mind in any body of hearers, it may be observed that for regular university purposes two conditions seem requisite. One is, that the hearers show the results of prior train-

ing, and be in possession of prior material, up to that point which the lecture to be delivered presupposes. The other condition is, that they command a degree of independent initiative and of mental vigor decided enough to work upon suggestions given, and to follow out a line designated. Now, with the popular lecturer addressing a mixed audience the state of things is not the same as with the university lecturer. In our mixed populations, and in the audiences which our Catholic popular lecturers are likely to gather before them, it rarely happens that they may take for granted the prior training and liberal education which the university lecturer has a right to presuppose. As to the independent initiative and mental vigor, which is the second condition to be noticed in an audience, there are some useful reflections which arise here. In the populations which we see around us, and which we notice to be so appreciative of educational results, we cannot fail to observe that many a young man, as well as many an elderly person, flocks to lectures not merely popular, but also of a university grade, in the fond hope of supplying at a leap what they feel to be a great deficiency in themselves, through the want of liberal studies. Their good will in the effort is seldom adequate for success. Difficulties beset their path; and they are difficulties both negative and positive. The deficiencies in the line of prior development are negative; as is also the want of previous material duly gathered and set in order. But there are, besides, positive obstructions to be encountered, in the preoccupation of the mind with crude, cross, mixed-up notions, which have been picked up everywhere, and which now obscure the vision, and make the rays of truth struggle into the mind as through a jungle or a thicket. Thus many a willing mind is hopelessly slow in feeling the cogency of a truth; it is at a loss what to do with new mental contributions; it knows not how to arrange them and where to locate them, so as to make them fit in gracefully with all the rest of its knowledge.

We are speaking of real lecturing, and of significant instruction. It is quite possible that one may profess to lecture and succeed only in entertaining. If the effort does not convey what is worthy of a permanent place in the mind either developed or maturing, it can be styled a lecture only by courtesy. It is properly an entertainment of a literary or artistic kind, and it may possibly convey what a carriage drive or a summer tour might teach. But that is only refreshing and entertaining; it is not lecturing.

There is another lesson which may be gathered from the professor's chair. It is on a very practical point, without which nothing can live. Finances are of vital importance in the endeavor to do good, and any facts or items of information which may throw light upon this subject are undoubtedly of prime consequence to

Catholics in their endeavors to promote true culture. It may be that plain facts here will sober down undue exhilaration of spirits; but they need not therefore extinguish noble ambition.

There is now going on in Great Britain an enterprise called the University Extension movement. It is under auspices that are most favorable and most fashionable. Powerful interest and enlightened taste combine to further the undertaking, and the utmost economy is observed to make the good of higher education extend as widely, because as cheaply, as possible. Just one difficulty meets the execution of the programme, and that is the finances. The facts are these: A body of authorized teachers, taken from the most highly-trained and successful graduates of the University, are formed to travel about the country and answer the demands made upon them for series of lectures, to be delivered in sets of not less than twelve lectures each. A number of such series, regularly attended, and finished with appropriate and strict examinations, will eventually raise an auditor to a valuable university degree. Those who can apply for such series of lectures, to be thus brought right down to their homes, are not only philosophical societies and institutes, free and subscription libraries, but also any special society or company formed for the purpose. Now, when these are happily managed and the audiences made large, it is found that the total charge for one of the courses need not exceed three shillings for the whole set of twelve lectures. Yet the financial difficulty is described as being the greatest thus far met with. It affects the lecturers, though they have the rich university at their back; and it affects the hearers, though these have not to leave their homes, but can receive the university advantages right at their doors. It is a curious development in the cause of culture. It is said that the lectures are assiduously frequented by all classes of society alike, and yet the seekers after knowledge do not seem to value knowledge at its cost price.

These are remarks which we are quoting from a scientific reviewer on the movement. We might add a reflection of our own. It would appear as if the divine law of giving, and receiving not, were the only one by which higher education could ever be imparted. Here we see that in a country like Great Britain, where traditions preponderate towards the esteem and use of higher studies, a popular and liberal project, with professorial ability thrown in without stint, must struggle in order to live, and that, too, when the pittance needed to live well is but a nominal fee. Nor is it a Catholic body that has the matter in hand. The suspicion arises in our mind that perhaps the professors of higher education have a latent vocation to become a new order of Knights of Science, vowed to poverty, if the spirit of science would only

make that fashionable, outside of the Catholic Church, and make them willing to subsist on the fortieth part of a university professor's salary, throwing in their health and their life as a martyr's contribution to the cause. We trust, indeed, that higher education and university development will, in the United States at least, move to a lighter step, and march on with a more cheerful air. But the observation made here by the reviewer whom we quoted before is quite apposite. Without being a Catholic, he implicitly pays that tribute which all history must concur in paying to the Catholic spirit and to Catholic times. He observes that the great work can never be furthered except by the same principles which founded the great monuments of educational zeal abiding to our day. "Higher education always did require the help of the patron of letters and of the founder of the college."

Nor is it only in letters, but in the most favored pursuits of science does the same financial obstruction bar the way. We have heard a plea made and reiterated, under the taking title of the "Endowment of Research." It was taken up and re-echoed far and wide. "The waste of water-power at Niagara," was the querulous strain indulged in, "is as nothing compared with the waste of brain-power, which results from compelling a man of exceptional qualifications to earn his own living. The owner of a great estate admits that the important charities of his town have a well-founded claim on his purse. It would not require a very great change of heart for him to feel a vivid sense of shame if a few scholars are not carrying on their researches at his expense." This appeal, instructive on its own account, had come reverberating from divers magazines on both sides of the ocean, when an Oxford professor had occasion the other day to deliver an address in his capacity as president of a newly-chartered institute of chemistry. He thought fit to animadvert upon the terms of this appeal. He called it "cant." He thought scientists might manage to live by their science, no matter how. His contention was that men of science had a right to live; let them use their science as a means of livelihood and live by it anyhow. To this a solemn editorial in a leading scientific journal gravely responded, protesting. It propounded its views on the whole duty of a chemist, and took the professor solemnly to task for his profane and low views.

Common spectators like ourselves may have a right to infer that, even on the privileged ground of science, finances are an element of disturbance; and, if so, how much more troublesome may they not be in the work of Catholic lectures. To these we now return; and we say that if the popular Catholic lecture would only go of itself, and the right kind of people would only come of themselves, and the expenses of the hall and other matters would only adjust

themselves automatically, while enlightenment could shine over all meanwhile, there would be no need of much financial management, nor of an organized arrangement to consolidate the business basis of the scheme. But, as things are, the one thing indispensable, next to the finances themselves, is some good management to set them in order and to keep them so.

There is no doubt but that much activity has lately been exhibited in the interest of Catholic lecturing. A suggestion was made some months ago, and it was credited to a distinguished writer in this *QUARTERLY*, that public conferences should be given by able Catholics on points of Christian doctrine; that the men who expounded such points should be able, by their ability and eloquence, to command the attendance of the curious and interested; and that the places chosen for the conferences should be those which could easily be reached by the mass of the infidel and the indifferent. Various laudable efforts have recently been made here and there. In Chicago a series of popular lectures have been given, apparently with such satisfaction that we have caught the echo of commendation returning from the other side of the Atlantic. In Baltimore we have seen a similar programme followed, and so far encouraging in its results as to suggest a flattering inference, which has, in fact, been drawn with regard to the prospects of a new university. Elsewhere similar efforts assume proportions to arrest general attention, and the excellent results upon mixed audiences seem positive indications of a great field opening. On this account, so much the more importance attaches to forming a right estimate of the whole enterprise.

In none of these instances which we have cited was the effort made separate from a Catholic institution, and flung out, as it were, into the midst of the general population. Yet this is a salient point to command a certain portion of the field. There is a large body of the population which labors under the weight of sheer prejudice with regard to our institutions; and though the presentation of philosophical subjects, of ethical and scientific questions, may well be considered to leave the collegiate hall free from the imputation of what the narrow mind calls "sectarianism," yet there is no arguing with a certain order of prejudice, there is no making it liberal, and a large class of the infidel and the indifferent will no more enter a Catholic institution than they will gather round a Catholic pulpit. Protestantism is not what it was. Indeed, there is little left of any Protestantism which can claim to have been before. That spirit of sectarianism which started in the sanctuary has now had time to find its way to the theatre. It has no pulpit, nor does it care to see one; no altar, nor will it hear from one; no

temple, nor will it find itself inside of one. There is "the appointed desolation"—barren infidelity.

This movement, which we call Protestantism, began in a disturbance, not unprovoked, of moral, social, and national life. It maintained, at first, a set of doctrines which the necessities of the moment postulated. The moment flitted, the necessities changed, and the doctrines grew. Able men and busy generations were not wanting to make them grow; and the law by which they did grow made them disintegrate into new systems, decompose into ulterior elements, and finally crumble into the dust which to-day strews all natural science with the thinnest residue of the supernatural. The law of dissolution which has brought it down to this is simply that of men's minds being active and every man having a mind of his own. When once the process of error and corruption has begun, nothing can withstand such a solvent as the action of men's minds upon the tenets and doctrines which are submitted to their criticism. This solvent is technically rationalism. It is a destroyer which has grown on the vitals of Protestantism; and the system of independent and wilful thought, which began at the pulpit and listened to the answers returned to it from the pulpit, is to-day abroad in the wide, wide world, as a wandering rationalism that knows neither guide nor compass, has neither faith nor hope, and is without God in the world. Now, it seems very useless to look for this fugitive spirit except by pursuing it, and on this view we could conceive a party of laymen organizing to have skepticism sought out and confronted, wherever it is likely to be found.

The Catholic Lecture Bureau of St. Louis started out upon such a principle. It formed itself of twelve laymen, who were moving about in the various walks of social and business life, and who by their position and influence could command attention and help to direct public opinion. They took special pains to select a subject which should be of live interest to every man of the times, and should enjoy a fair chance of engaging the widest attention by being treated in a public hall. The subject chosen was "Culture and its Relation to the Modern Mind;" which relation naturally divided itself into the four aspects of religion, arts, science and social life. The gentlemen tendered an invitation to different lecturers, soliciting the favor of hearing them treat the whole subject in due order before an audience indiscriminate as to its religion, but as select as could be in point of culture. The result of their negotiation was that the Right Rev. Bishop Keane, of Richmond, spoke of the religious sentiment under the title of the "Light of the World;" Rev. Thomas O'Gorman, of Merriam Park, Minn., treated the social aspect under the name of "Man's Aims in Society;" Right Rev. Bishop Spalding discussed the side of the liberal arts under

the head of "Self-Education;" and the Rev. Thomas Hughes, S. J., treated the side of "Scientific Culture." The audience in actual attendance comprised the best representation of the non-Catholic community. And it is confidently affirmed that financially, as well as intellectually, it has been the most successful course of lectures given in St. Louis, whether under Catholic or non-Catholic auspices.

Be that as it may, we are not of the opinion that any personal attractiveness or intellectual excellence of individual men will ever succeed in making of a lecture programme a financial success. If the one before us has been successful, it is owing, we imagine, to the constitution of a bureau. Here it is just the same as with mercantile enterprise. The best work offered will not bring customers, unless the work is brought home to the customers. They expect to be waited upon. Style and lecturing are become such a common commodity, not without proving to be counterfeit sometimes, that the public are to be excused if they show themselves not over-hasty in running to a lecture hall. We know of a case in a single great city where, in a short space of time, one popular preacher of great name, a New England divine, and another speaker of not less notoriety, failed utterly to gather an audience, the one a single time, the other twice. We must understand, then, that clever management, proper advertising, personal activity on the part of laymen who are themselves moving in the different walks of social life and are prominent,—all these are functions of what we conceive as a business bureau. Their time and personal concurrence in the work are perhaps of more value than the financial risks which they are willing to stand. And certainly no greater title to respect could add dignity and weight to their invitation, when they solicit the best talent in the country to lecture under their auspices, than that they themselves should be known to be acting on pure Catholic principle, to be risking money, sacrificing time, and devoting all surplus proceeds to the poor, merely for the sake of rendering possible a work of highest zeal, of genuine devotion, and of true Christian charity.

We should anticipate some specific difficulties in an enterprise like this. It has often seemed to us that Catholics might be excused from many things, not only because their numbers are limited, but also because what they have in the way of means, and what they themselves are in personal ability, are both largely preoccupied in work and business of their own. And when there is question of new efforts in the way of charity or zeal, though true charity is boundless, and zeal is a fire that never burns too brightly, still we say that the general excuse has often seemed plausible. The men are preoccupied; their available funds are preëngaged in

charities already urgent. Money, therefore, and what is often more precious than money, the personal work and personal activity, and the time necessary for this, are oftentimes not forthcoming. Whatever the case may have been with regard to the efforts of this bureau, we observe that no lay speaker was engaged to expound any part of their first year's programme. The fact suggests a useful reflection; whether perhaps, even if capable men are really preoccupied by business, such work as this may not be rightly classed by them under the head of business. If endowing a charity with permanent funds is generous, why should it not be generous, nay, from a Catholic point of view, imperative, to endow the public mind with the funds of one's mental treasures? It seems the noblest business that can claim a place; and, if a place, then its own degree of precedence.

And to finish our sketch of the work with an observation upon the subjects treated, we would not have it understood that only the negative work of meeting rationalistic ills, and curing the diseases of the mind, is the full function to be discharged in this lay mission of lecturing. It is true that one part of the function is medicinal and corrective; but the better part is primarily corroborative and constructive. All that is positive in Christianity, and all which in Christendom is due to the progress of the Church, is a principal part of the lecturer's work before the world. If Protestantism has retrograded and disintegrated, the spirit of Christianity, and all that is due to the influence of the Church, has gone forward on its way with the advance of years. If Protestantism is not where it was, neither are we, but in quite an opposite sense. Whether the "Reformation" had come or not to leaven the mass of Christendom with the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, the Church would still have continued leavening it with her spirit as of old. That spirit of hers is truth in every order; not merely in matters of faith and morals, but in matters of art also, of science, of industry, of social progress. The institutions which she had founded early have all developed, from constitutional governments down to primary schools. The literatures which she had set a-growing, and for which she had stood as godmother in fostering the national life of peoples, were all in process of unfolding when Protestantism came, and they were still to be beautified in their respective tongues. The art of printing, which had been invented, was already at work in making all the treasures of enlightenment a common property of men. The fine arts owned the Church as their sole custodian and patroness. Science was to march forward, keeping the line on which her priests and scientific men had set it moving. Protestantism came. Did that change the rights of ownership and the prerogatives of patronage and taste? It did

change much, as we know. But in spite of the disasters which it occasioned, it could not stop the progress of the spirit with which the Church was leavening and has since leavened nations. And Protestantism even fell into line and coöperated. But it has always been with this remarkable difference: that the most beautiful thoughts of the most infidel mind are always Christian, sprung from the inspiration of the Church; while whatever is distinctly non-Catholic is distinctly neither beautiful nor moral.

All this, then, is ours. The beautiful and the moral, the intellectual and the true, all are ours in the right of our Catholicity. This is the positive side of our work, to exhibit all this to the world; and it is a work not restricted to the pulpit, but is common to it and to the professor's chair, and to the mission of lecturing on the secular platform. We cannot afford to leave our patrimony for strangers to appropriate. Nor can we give things which are holy to those who own them not. And, indeed, aliens claim these things, and arrogate them in such a vein that you would think all science was born with them, and the arts would have died but for them, and that letters are their handmaid, and all civilization only their precious heirloom to posterity. No, *sancta sanctis*, holy things to the holy, and truthful things to the true.

THE TRADITIONAL MISREPRESENTATION OF
IRELAND.

THE chances that a National Parliament will be again called to meet in Dublin after nearly a century's efforts to force the unnatural Union with England on the Irish people, are now among the highly probable events of politics. After a lengthened period of refusal to even hear the Irish demand for self-government, and a few months of noisy protest against the idea of granting it, the English public appears to have settled down to regarding Irish Home Rule as inevitable, and though its national prejudices will no doubt flare out again and again during the discussion of the question, there will be no strong popular movement against its concession outside Parliament. The House of Lords will doubtless oppose the measure stubbornly, but in the present state of the British Constitution the Lords must and always do yield to a strong majority in the Commons. The question to be solved is, will the House of Commons decide in favor of granting Home Rule to Ireland? If it does, Home Rule will be an established fact in no very long time. If not, the Parliamentary struggle must be renewed between the English and the Irish representatives at Westminster, until the former are forced to yield.

Much of the hope of a speedy close of the struggle undoubtedly rests on the friendly disposition of Mr. Gladstone towards Irish Home Rule. His control over his own party in the House of Commons is almost absolute, and the great majority will follow wherever he leads. He carried the Disestablishment of the Irish State Church, with but little aid from the nominal representatives of Ireland, through Parliament, though it was a measure not less repugnant than Home Rule is to the blind prejudice which forms so marked a character of English public opinion. The regulation of the relations between landlord and tenant, independently of the will of the landlords, was equally unpalatable to the commercial instincts of the dominant trading classes in England who would hold, like Shylock, to the necessity of enforcing a bond at any cost. Both Disestablishment and the Land Bill were distinctively Gladstone's own measures. His colleagues at the time, as a rule, felt less interest in their success than even do their successors to-day in the granting of Home Rule, and yet both measures have been carried into law by the force of Mr. Gladstone's will. That the veteran statesman has, to a certain extent, sympathies with the

rights of nations even against English rule, is also true. He withdrew the English protectorate over the Ionian Islands more than twenty years ago in deference mainly to the demand of the people for union with Greece. He renounced, after a short struggle, the control over the Transvaal, which had been lawlessly seized by his predecessor. Small instances of generosity as those may seem to weigh against the bombardment of Alexandria, the invasion of the Soudan, and the seizure of Burmah, we believe they are unique in modern English history. The lawless annexations and invasions are a part of the common public policy of the Empire; the giving up of plunder freely is exclusively the act of Mr. Gladstone. All this is undoubtedly encouraging to the hopes which the majority of the Irish race now feel of the speedy restoration of their national government.

It will not do, however, to believe the victory already won because Mr. Gladstone is well-disposed, and the Irish members a formidable power in Parliament. The paths of politics, and especially those of English foreign politics, are dark. It is little over four years since Gladstone himself consigned Messrs. Parnell, Dillon, Sexton and O'Kelly to solitary imprisonment, on no charge but that of differing in opinion with himself on the value of his reform measures in Ireland. Mr. Forster commenced his career as Irish Secretary with the strongest professions of sympathy with the wrongs of the Irish people, and of his own determination to redress them. In four months time his system of redress reduced itself to the summary imprisonment of every Irishman who presumed to criticise his government. No voice was louder in its denunciation of the iniquity of English rule in Ireland than John Bright's twenty years ago, yet few English statesmen to-day are more bitterly opposed to the abolition of that rule, when its destruction is a question of practical politics and no longer one of mere declamation. Mr. Chamberlain's professions of the broadest liberality towards Ireland, three or four years ago, have not kept him from raising his voice fiercely against any project for allowing her people to govern themselves. With these examples before our eyes, it is only common sense for Irishmen to put little trust in the consistency or sense of justice of any English statesman, unless those qualities be stimulated by a sense of enlightened self-interest.

In speaking thus we are far from seeking to discourage the well-grounded hopes of the Irish people for a speedy recovery of their national government. Those hopes rest on a much stronger basis than the good-will of any English minister; they rest on the growing strength and wisdom of the Irish race itself, and the necessities of the British Empire. But, looking back on history, we

cannot but remark how often the cause of the Irish people has been ruined for the time by an excessive trust in the honor of English ministers. Pitt's promise of Catholic Emancipation was an important factor in bringing about the ill-starred Union, and the deluded nation found too late that a temporary resignation of office was all that the all-powerful minister needed to relieve himself of his inconvenient pledge. The reluctant acknowledgment of Irish parliamentary independence, in 1782, was received with a short-sighted enthusiasm which allowed the quiet suppression of the volunteer force, which alone had extorted that measure from the fears of the government, but which was thoughtlessly attributed to its generosity. The pledged word of William of Orange, a century earlier, had induced the soldiers of Sarsfield to lay down their arms in the full confidence that their religious and personal liberties were secured ; but that word was broken without a moment's hesitation, as soon as the French fleet had sailed from Limerick. The older Confederation of Kilkenny might have easily achieved national independence half a century before, if the majority of its leaders had not allowed their policy to be moulded by a blind trust in the promises of Ormond, rather than the rules of practical statesmanship. An unwarranted trust in the promises of the unworthy son of Mary Queen of Scots had brought about the cessation of Hugh O'Neill's struggle for Irish liberty, at the beginning of the same century, and paved the way for the Plantation of Ulster and the Penal Laws. "Put not your trust in princes," is a lesson written on every page of Irish history, and one which should never be forgotten by the Irish people.

To comprehend the reason of the excessive trust in the pledges of foreign statesmen, which has been so often shown by the Irish people, we must take a somewhat wider view than is usually done of the relations between England and Ireland. The struggle between the Irish and English races, the one seeking liberty and the other domination, and neither fully succeeding in its object, is on the whole unexampled in its duration in history. The strife between the Spanish Christians and the Moslem Saracens for the possession of the Peninsula is the nearest parallel to it, but with this important difference, that the contending races in the British Empire seem to have almost the same relative strength to-day as they had when the struggle began with Henry the Second. The ministers of Queen Victoria, in the nineteenth century, find it as hard a task to bring Ireland into full subjection to English rule as the Norman barons of the Plantagenets found it in the twelfth. Every century during the intervening time has seen the struggle go on with varying fortunes and under various forms, but with the one essential feature of Ireland against England. Normans and

Tudors, Cromwellians and Williamites have in turn established their various ascendancies only to pass away in a few generations, and to leave the population of Ireland still as distinct in blood and character from that of Britain as it was when Strongbow first set foot on Irish soil. The vitality of the Celtic race has not failed in the long contest, but its national organization has been shattered; and it is this circumstance which makes the struggle so peculiar a one. Race hostilities have, unhappily, been only too common in history, and have often lasted through long periods. The Hundred Years War between France and England, from Edward the Third to Henry the Sixth, the equally long contest between the House of Bourbon and that of Austria during the seventeenth century, and the antagonism between Russia and Poland, are examples of national quarrels lasting through many generations, but each of them is quite different from the struggle between the English and the Irish races. In the former cases it was government against another government as well as race against race. In Ireland it has been the struggle of a race without a national government against a hostile race fully organized. The forces of statecraft and diplomacy have been almost entirely on the side of England, and their very nature has scarcely been apprehended by the Irish people. That truth and honor have a different meaning in the mouths of rulers and politicians from that which they really bear amongst men, has never been realized fully in Ireland. Hence a readiness to accept specious promises from their adversaries, which in its turn has made such promises its favorite instrument with English statesmen in their dealings with Ireland. The attitude of the Irish people towards the English government has been not unlike that of a simple witness in the hands of a crafty and unscrupulous lawyer. The latter has a code of ethics of his own, distinct from the ordinary rules of intercourse between man and man, and he avails himself of it to the fullest to entrap his opponent. Pitted against an adversary like himself, he would not venture to expose himself to retorts in kind; but as he has no fears of such, he allows himself the fullest liberty to make truth appear falsehood and falsehood truth. Such has been to a great extent the conduct of English statesmen in the relations with Ireland. They recognize no obligations of right and wrong in general, even such as are universally accepted by civilized nations. The English Parliament would never dream of violating the Treaty of Ryswick or of Utrecht, but it felt no scruple about setting aside the equally solemn obligations of the Treaty of Limerick. The ministers of Elizabeth would hardly have ventured on employing assassins to take the life of Philip of Spain, and they would certainly have disowned such measures in public; but they felt no scruples about bargaining for the murder of Shane,

Diomas, or Hugh O'Neill. The latter were only Irish leaders, so any measures against them were consistent with English ideas of public honor.

This spirit runs all through the dealings of the British government, whether royal or parliamentary, with the Irish people. It has contributed not a little to mystifying the Irish cause in the eyes of nations outside the quarrel. It is hard for a Frenchman or a Spaniard to understand that when English public men of high standing speak of the prevalence of crime in Ireland, they do not mean that it is nearly as prevalent as in their own land, or that lawlessness in Ireland means a refusal of the people at large to submit to the lawlessness of officials and a self-styled ascendancy class. The question is much easier to understand when it is borne in mind that the Irish policy of the government is almost wholly moulded on the traditions handed down for centuries in the bureaux of Dublin Castle. Each generation of English politicians denounces the acts of its predecessors in Ireland, but each is equally ready to use the weapons of misrepresentation against the Irish people.

It should be remembered, when we are dealing with English misrepresentations of the Irish national struggle in our own day, that they only carry out the policy which has been consistently followed by the English government during the last three centuries. The efforts of Elizabeth to force the Irish people to the profession of a creed in which they disbelieved are at the present day denounced by every public man in England, but at the time they were unctuously boasted of as a reformation of religion and a restoration of God's worship. The hiring of poisoners to make away with Shane O'Neill while the Queen of England professed to treat him as an ally, was only a "subtlety" of statecraft in the eyes of the English rulers of the day, who plumed themselves on their English honor and English honesty as much as do their successors. The confiscation of Ulster and the expulsion of its inhabitants from their ancestral lands was, in the words of Sir John Davies and his colleagues, a planting of law and justice in a barbarous country. Strafford's seizure of the property of a peaceful province under pretext of legal flaws in the titles of its landholders was, in the words of that nobleman, nothing but a vindication of the sovereign's just claims to his own. The confiscation of the lands of the Irish Catholics by the Parliament which sent Charles the First to the block, was described as a just punishment of rebellion against authority. Cromwell's sweeping three-fourths of Ireland of its native population by beat of drum and under pain of death, was, in the English phraseology of the day, a godly purification of an idolatrous land, and not, as Mr. Chamberlain, or even Lord Salisbury, would now describe it, the extermination of a people for

the profit of England. Two short years after the death of the Protector, when the system of government and state religion which he had set up was overthrown, and described by Parliament as a wicked and traitorous rebellion, the Broghills, Orrerys and Cootes, who had been its chief agents in Ireland, were continued in the possession of the plunder they had acquired at the cost of Irish loyalists. The title given to this proceeding by the Court of Charles the Second was an Act of Settlement, and the robbery of the Irish population was legalized on the plea of not disturbing the rights of property. The invasion of Ireland by the Dutch usurper of the English throne was invariably spoken of by his adherents as a vindication of national liberty. The Irishmen who fought at the Boyne, and Athlone, and Aughrim, and Limerick for the defence of their land and its king and parliament, were constantly spoken of as rebels, and the infamous Penal Code was during nearly a century described as an almost perfect system of civil and religious freedom. The absurdity of such claims seems too great for belief, but they were constantly repeated with an appearance of good faith that might well impose on the world at large. Indeed, they even made some impression on a part of the Irish people themselves. Irish Catholics were found in '98 to publicly express their gratitude for the protection of the law, and to compare favorably the freedom which they enjoyed under the British Constitution with that of the natives of other lands under absolute rulers or rabid revolutionists. It seems impossible that men whose lives and liberties were at the absolute mercy of martial law and a bloodthirsty oligarchy, should imagine that they were really in the enjoyment of an enviable degree of freedom; yet such was actually to some extent the case in Ireland. It is little wonder that a large part of its people should have taken the political harangues of ministers for proofs of friendship, and confounded the shams of political intrigue with the honest management of public affairs.

The increasing knowledge of the Irish people has already had a good effect in lessening the misrepresentations of English statesmen; and as the former increases, the latter will no doubt decrease still further. Messrs. Parnell, Dillon, and Davitt are no longer "instigators of murder" and unconvicted traitors, in the language of English politicians; and the necessity of depriving the Irish people of their freedom to keep them from exterminating one another, is no longer insisted on since it has been found impossible to enforce coercion. The London press, however, and its American copyists still keep up the tradition with an energy worthy of a better cause, and not without some effect outside England as well as within it. For Irishmen, the best weapon against such attacks is

a clear comprehension of their nature. Their utterers have no belief in the charges they make, and indeed are generally quite indifferent as to their truth or falsehood. The only thing they seek is news; and if an invention will serve the place of a fact, it is furnished as readily, and often as readily accepted by the public.

As for the trust in individual English statesmen which has so often been shown by the Irish people, we sincerely hope its day has gone never to return. We believe that Mr. Gladstone is morally and intellectually far above the level of most of his colleagues and rivals in English politics, but we hardly think him capable of subordinating his political interests to his conscience to any heroic degree. We can count to a certain extent on generous impulses in his actions since his career has shown that he is capable of them. That he desires at present to crown his long career by a happy termination of the long struggle between England and Ireland, we can well believe; but this, too, is rather a sentiment than a principle. Generous impulses are very good things in a powerful ruler, but they are liable to be somewhat capricious, and we do not care to build very lofty castles on such foundations. We shall doubtless hear much during the next few months of English generosity in relation to Ireland, but on that feeling we are even less disposed to rely than on the impulses of Mr. Gladstone. The best guarantee that exists for Home Rule is that its refusal is a serious menace to the existence of the Empire, and that English statesmen are beginning at length to realize the fact. It may not be necessary to proclaim it ostentatiously, but such is the true reason why Home Rule has taken such a prominent place in British politics to-day.

GOD AND AGNOSTICISM.

THE recent controversy between Mr. Spencer and Mr. Harrison has had at least the good effect of defining more clearly than ever the position of Agnosticism and that of its sister infidelity, Positivism. Their attitude towards Christianity is more distinctly perceived, as well as those issues wherein each agrees and disagrees with the other. Mr. Harrison, as spokesman for Positivism, declares that it has accepted Mr. Spencer's doctrine of the inconceivability of the First Cause as enunciated in "First Principles." Reasoning logically from this premiss, furnished by Mr. Spencer himself, it has reached the conclusion that the function of religion cannot be to cherish, as an object of adoration and reverence, this Unknowable outside of human thought and consciousness. But, as religion is a necessity to human nature and to the regulation of human conduct, the proper object of such veneration is to be found in humanity itself. Mr. Spencer, on the other hand, scouts and ridicules the conceit of a creed and cultus founded either upon the abstract notion of humanity or on its collective concretion, and stoutly maintains that the only and proper object of religious worship is that infinite and eternal energy "from which all things proceed," and which, he warns us, is, at the same time, unknown and unknowable. The function of religion Mr. Spencer conceives to be the fostering of this mystery along with the perpetual inculcation of its insolubility.

Without attempting to pass judgment upon the antagonisms, which the late controversy has revealed between Mr. Spencer's Agnosticism and Mr. Harrison's Positivism, it will be interesting to go back to that premiss which both, in common, accept as indubitably true. Is Mr. Spencer's doctrine of the Unknowable upon the substantial footing that both claim? Has it that consistency with sound reason that both assert? The answer to these questions will bring us back to Mr. Spencer's "First Principles," wherein the doctrine of inconceivability is discussed fundamentally and at length. Accepted, as it has been, without dispute by a certain class of thinkers, it has established itself with many as a profound and irrefragable refutation of theological and metaphysical conceptions. Mr. Harrison says that Mr. Spencer, as much as any living man, has torn "the slip-slop of theologians finally to shreds;" and such is the current belief with those who either accept, without investigation, the authority of Mr. Spencer's dictum, or who,

finding the speculations of metaphysical science too labored and painful for their abilities or time, congratulate the weakness of their intelligence in the thought that theology and metaphysics are, after all, absurdities which Mr. Spencer's trenchant criticism has finally exposed. Metaphysicians and theologians, in consequence, have been rated as charlatans. It will, perhaps, be startling to Mr. Spencer's followers to call in question their master's first principles, and still more startling to learn that they do not rest upon as secure a basis as is imagined.

The second chapter of "First Principles" opens with an illustration of the incompetency of the human mind to conceive things as they are. This illustration treats of its failure to imagine the actual curvature of the whole circumference of the earth.

"We cannot conceive, in its real form and magnitude, even that small segment of our globe which extends a hundred miles on every side of us; much less the globe as a whole. The piece of rock on which we stand can be mentally represented with something like completeness; we find ourselves able to think of its top, its sides, and its under surface at the same time, or so nearly at the same time that they seem all present in consciousness together; and so we can form what we call a conception of a rock. But to do the like with the earth we find impossible. If even to imagine the antipodes as at that distant place in space which it actually occupies, is beyond our power, much more beyond our power must it be at the same time to imagine all other remote points on the earth's surface as in their actual places. Yet we habitually speak as though we had an idea of the earth—as though we could think of it in the same way we think of minor objects."

In this passage we first ascertain Mr. Spencer's notion of ideology. In proportion to the magnitude of the object, the greater grows the impossibility of conceiving it. Magnitude, then, is the gauge of our power of conception. The smaller an object is, the better we can represent it in thought, and the larger it is, the less chance it has of being conceived. We can, mentally, represent "the piece of rock on which we stand with something like completeness," because its likeness can be crowded more easily into the mind than if it were a thousand times as large. An elephant can be pretty well represented in thought, but if the animal were fifty times as huge, it would stand fifty times less opportunity of being mentally grasped. It is to be observed in the passage just quoted, that Mr. Spencer uses the words *imagine* and *conceive* in exactly the same sense. "We cannot *conceive* in its real form, etc.," and, "if even to *imagine* the antipodes, etc.," and, again, "the piece of rock on which we stand can be *mentally represented*, etc." Do *imagine*, *conceive*, and *mentally represent* express one and the same idea in Mr. Spencer's mind? Such, evidently, is the implication in this passage, and such must we infer it to be from the application of the principle he deduces from this illustration. It is here we must put in our demurrer. Mr. Spencer confuses two distinct

operations, imagining and conceiving, and would deduce from the impotency of one the defect of the other. Imagination is a faculty which concretely represents objects, and intellect is a faculty which abstractly represents them. Because the imagination fails to completely and adequately picture the total circumference of the earth's surface, it does not, therefore, follow that our abstract concept of the earth is unlike the reality. Mr. Spencer declares in the following paragraph that our conception of the earth is drawn from two ideas, that of "an indefinitely extended mass beneath our feet," and that of "a body like a terrestrial globe;" "and thus we form of the earth, not a conception properly so-called, but only a symbolic conception." As Mr. Spencer has not told us what is a "conception properly so-called," he leaves it to be inferred what a "symbolic conception" is. As nearly as we can ascertain from the passage we have quoted, a "conception properly so-called" is with Mr. Spencer simply the phantasm of the imagination, and a "symbolic conception" means an abstraction. Our idea of the earth is formed, he tells us, by coupling together the idea of "an indefinitely extended mass beneath our feet," and "a body like a terrestrial globe." What he really means is that, from the phantasms of this "indefinitely extended mass beneath our feet," and of this or that "body like a terrestrial globe," we abstract our idea of the earth. But it is not a legitimate deduction to conclude that our concept of the earth is merely symbolic and unrepresentative of the reality, because the phantasm of the imagination fails to picture in its totality the circumferential magnitude of the earth. By whatever methods, direct or indirect, we learn that the earth is a sphere, our conception of it, as a sphere, is a true and real representation, and not simply symbolic, which, according to Mr. Spencer, can only signify unrepresentative.

Mr. Spencer's next step in ideology is to show that a large proportion of our conceptions, "including all those of much generality," are of this symbolical order, or truly unrepresentative. "Great magnitudes, great durations, great numbers, are none of them actually conceived, but are all of them conceived more or less symbolically; and so, too, are all those classes of objects, of which we predicate some common fact." He proceeds to illustrate this by an example, beginning with a particular, and then, by process of abstraction, dropping out of thought, first one note and then another passes up the scale over a series of universals, each last more universal than the preceding. In proportion as he ascends the scale of universals, does the concept become less representative and more symbolic. His symbolic ideas are, therefore, nothing more than generalizations; and the more generic the idea, the more symbolic it becomes, and consequently less representa-

tive. All abstractions, according to this doctrine, are symbolic, and do not truly represent realities. It is only concrete phantasms which represent objects in their reality. When, then, I predicate the idea *man* of any individual, I am not attributing to him any reality; I am simply using a symbolic conception, to which there corresponds no reality in the individual. When I say, "this animal is a mammal," there is nothing in the animal itself corresponding to my predicate, which is simply symbolic. Such is Mr. Spencer's process throughout. Our symbolic conceptions, when they cannot be verified by "cumulative or indirect processes of thought," are "altogether vicious and illusive, and in no way distinguishable from pure fictions." But why they cease to be "pure fictions" when verified by "cumulative or indirect processes of thought," we are left vainly to imagine. Certainly no "cumulative or indirect process of thought" can ever make an abstraction a concretion, or a conception a phantasm; and, according to Mr. Spencer, it is only phantasms which are truly representative. Upon this system of ideology Mr. Spencer proceeds to build his doctrine of the Unknowable. If all he assumes be granted, he has, indeed, an easy task to convince the mind that accepts his premises.

The three systems of philosophy accounting for the origin of the universe, Mr. Spencer informs us, are, "that it is self-existent, or that it is self-created, or that it is created by an external agency." All three are alike unthinkable, Mr. Spencer asserts, and in their ultimate analysis evaporate into contradictions. Respecting the first of these Mr. Spencer argues that the idea of self-existence presents an inconceivability:

"In the first place, it is clear by self-existence we especially mean an existence independent of any other—not produced by any other—the assertion of self-existence is simply an indirect denial of creation. In thus excluding any idea of any antecedent cause we necessarily exclude the idea of a beginning; for to admit the idea of a beginning, to admit that there was a time when the existence had not commenced, is to admit that its commencement was determined by something, or was caused, which is a contradiction. Self-existence, therefore, necessarily means an existence without a beginning, and to form a conception of self-existence is to form a conception of existence without a beginning. Now, by no mental effort can we do this. To conceive existence through infinite past time implies the conception of infinite past time, which is an impossibility."

Mr. Spencer's reason for concluding the impossibility of thinking self-existence is, that this idea implies the notion of infinite past time. It is in this he is to be disputed. The idea of self-existence does not include that of infinite past time, but excludes it. Existence without a beginning necessarily means existence outside of time, for time necessarily begins, and self-existence, as Mr. Spencer himself admits, means existence without a beginning.

To conceive a self-existence which begins to be is impossible, no doubt; and when Mr. Spencer attempts to associate the ideas of self-existence and beginning, he naturally enough finds incompatible concepts. Time necessarily implies succession, but self-existence excludes the idea of succession, because it *implies* the idea of complete and perfect being, which is repugnant to successive being. Self-existence means the most perfect and complete existence which repudiates all mutations of time. Instead, then, of including the concept of infinite past time, which Mr. Spencer would saddle upon it in order to argue its inconceivability, our idea of self-existence transcends and negatives all notion of time. How, then, on this score it is mentally inconceivable, remains to be proved. It is easy enough to form a notion of an inconceivable by associating two incongruous ideas, and thereby develop a contradiction. I can associate the idea of *square* and *circle*, and get the inconceivable *square-circle*, which process is analogous to Mr. Spencer's method of arguing the inconceivability of self-existence. He would place the self-existent under the category of time, which implies beginning and succession, and then complacently conclude that self-existence is a contradiction, because it fails to agree with a notion intrinsically repugnant to it. This is making the man to fit the suit, and not the suit to fit the man. As long as Mr. Spencer argues that this universe cannot be self-existent, we must agree with him, and for the very reason which we have used against him, viz., that the mutable and successive are repugnant to the idea of self-existence. But when Mr. Spencer argues that the idea of self-existence is an intrinsic contradiction, because he would make it include the idea of infinite past time, which denotes succession and mutation, reason cannot agree with him; and if we refuse to call his argument sound, it arises from the fact that sound sense forces us to this view.

The hypothesis of self-creation does include the contradiction which Mr. Spencer argues. His exceptions to this theory we pass over, and agree with him in his conclusion. To what we mainly wish to turn our attention is his argument against the hypothesis, as he terms it, of an external cause as accounting for the universe. Passing by his argument in regard to the impossibility of conceiving the non-existence of space with the remark that this impossibility is but the figment of his own imagination, since he is really endeavoring to outstrip the phantasm of his own imagination by projecting one image beyond the other, as a foolish hound might endeavor to outstrip his own shadow, we will turn to the main consideration of the question. Of course he applies his supposed inconceivable self-existent to the external Cause of the universe, against which, he asserts, it equally holds. This we have seen to

be the result of a misconception on his part. Mr. Spencer admits, and, indeed, argues, back to a First Cause; but, like self-existence, he holds that this First Cause is inconceivable. It is in our endeavors to conceive the nature of this First Cause that we run against "intolerable contradictions." It is either finite or infinite; it cannot be finite, for that immediately throws us into the absurdity of supposing it to be dependent upon another, which is tantamount to saying it is not first. But

"to think of the First Cause as totally independent is to think of it as that which exists in the absence of all other existences, seeing that if the presence of any other existence is necessary, it must be partially dependent on that existence, and so cannot be the First Cause."

In this passage we observe, first, an assumption without warrant, to the effect that "to think of the First Cause as totally independent is to think of it as that which exists in the *absence* of all others." Why, in order to be independent, it is necessary that the First Cause should exist in the *absence* of all others, is not stated, unless it be upon the further assumption that the First Cause *necessarily* produces its effects. Then it remains to be proved that the First Cause necessarily creates, which Mr. Spencer not only fails to do, but which, upon his own hypothesis of the Unknowable, he could not possibly do. As long as the First Cause is conceived, as it must properly be conceived, to create voluntarily, it cannot be argued that the presence of its effects limits its independence. On the contrary, since its effects can be or can not be, that is, are contingent beings dependent upon the will of their Creator for existence, so much the more distinctly is its independence shown in the fact that its effects are totally dependent upon it for their being, and can be cancelled at the fiat of its will. Their contingency demonstrates indubitably the total independence of their cause. Whether they exist or not, it remains untouched in its existence, and its independence is more clearly seen in the light of their utter dependence upon it. Strange is that logic which argues that the First Cause is dependent upon its effect for its existence. We must, therefore, entirely deny Mr. Spencer's assumption, when he asserts that "to think of the First Cause as totally independent is to think of it as that which exists in the *absence* of all other existences." The presence of contingent beings does not in the slightest restrict the independence of their cause. Mr. Spencer's argument resolves itself briefly into this: If there be present to the First Cause any other existence external to itself, then is its independence restricted, and it, therefore, ceases to be first. But there are external existences whose presence is necessary; therefore the first independent is not independent. This is, of course, a con-

tradiction; *ergo*, the First Cause is inconceivable. The assumption is apparent that the presence of other existences is necessary, and limits the independence of the First Cause. It is, therefore, to be denied that the presence of other beings is necessary, and that their presence limits the First Cause; their presence is not necessary, for they are essentially contingent *unnecessary* existences, and altogether dependent upon the First Cause; nor does their presence shackle the independence of the First Cause, for the reason that they owe their being to it, and are entirely subject to its will, which may cancel their existence at any moment. In the face of the foregoing Mr. Spencer's inconceivable vanishes. As in his argument against the conceivability of self-existence, so in his argument against the First Cause, we find his fallacy to consist in an endeavor to consociate incompatible concepts, which he labels "inconceivables," and foists upon the unwary reader as true, metaphysical, and theological conceptions of the self-existent and first Cause. Between Mr. Spencer's perversion and the true metaphysical conception there is as wide a distinction as exists between being and its negation, as between a circle and the contradiction, a square-circle. To the reader whose intellect may not be acute or well versed in matters metaphysical, this substitution is not perceived, and naturally enough he casts the *odium theologicum* upon the science of natural theology for breeding such intellectual monstrosities and forcing them upon the consciences of men. There are not a few who believe, for they cannot be said to hold it upon "rational conviction, that Mr. Spencer, as much as any living man, has finally torn to shreds the slip-slop of theologians," and this credulity comes entirely from the ignorant adoption of Mr. Spencer's metaphysical nightmare.

Having endeavored to show that the presence of external existences throws our conception of a First Cause into an inconceivable, Mr. Spencer continues his discussion with an attempt to prove that any "internal relation" conceived in the First Cause shows a like contradiction. "Not only, however, must the First Cause be a form of being which has no necessary relation to any other form of being, but it can have no necessary relation within itself." What he seems to mean by *necessary relation within itself* we find in the next sentence: "There can be nothing in it which determines change, and yet nothing which prevents change." The change which Mr. Spencer speaks of can only mean, in the light of the context, change within the First Cause itself. Here is his reason for this assertion: "For if it contains something which imposes such necessities or restraints, this something must be a cause higher than the First Cause, which is absurd." • Respecting Mr. Spencer's position on this point, it is to be first said that a First Cause and self-existent being necessarily postulates immutability;

that is, it cannot be any other being, and furthermore *must* be; it could *not* be. It is, therefore, a *necessary* being; but that which determines its necessity to be is its own nature. Because it is an independent being, unproduced, self-existent, its existence is necessary. If the necessity of its existence, which is its very essence, be what Mr. Spencer terms a "necessary relation within itself," then is Mr. Spencer's assumption to be denied *in toto*. His language is altogether irrelevant and misleading, if by necessary relation he means the necessity of existence in the First Cause, for between the First Cause and its own essence there can only be complete and perfect identity.

The hiatus here in Mr. Spencer's argument is so wide that it is difficult to comprehend what he does mean. Necessary relation within itself cannot plainly mean the necessity of the First Cause's existence, and yet it is almost beyond effort to think that Mr. Spencer can mean anything else. In the light of this is the absurdity of Mr. Spencer's next sentence made evident: "There can be nothing in it which determines change, and yet nothing which prevents change." Certainly there can be nothing in a self-existent First Cause which determines change within itself, for there is *everything* within it to prevent change; the very immutability of its own essence, its own self-necessity, renders change within it an impossibility. To predicate change, therefore, of the necessary immutable is a flagrant contradiction, but it is by no means a proper conception of the First Cause. It is for the very reason that there is nothing within the First Cause to determine change that there is everything within it to prevent change. When, therefore, Mr. Spencer would draw his preposterous conclusion, or rather when he makes the naked assumption that the idea of a First Cause *necessitates* the concomitant notion of changeable immutability, we repudiate his illegitimate method as an insult to our intelligence, unfair to the metaphysical standpoint, and a perversion of truth. In this instance, as in every other we have considered, Mr. Spencer begs the question. He assumes each time what he wishes to prove. He asserts that the conception of a self-existence and a First Cause is a contradiction, and then proceeds to prove his point by an analysis of his own misconception. Instead of giving the true metaphysical conception, he substitutes in its place his own perverted notion made up of conflicting concepts, and then declares that the inconceivability of a First Cause is made manifest. This is what Mr. Frederick Harrison calls tearing the "slip-slop of theologians to shreds."

As if to pile Pelion upon Ossa, Mr. Spencer next proceeds to quote Dean Mansel on the side of the inconceivable. This is as if to say: "Reader, here is the argument of a *theologian*, who recognizes the truth of what I have said, and agrees with me that his

God, after all, is unknowable." But Mr. Mansel has fallen into exactly the same error of which Mr. Spencer is guilty. Mr. Spencer's auxiliary is as blind as himself, and their mutual error by no means makes truth. It is far from a triumph for the former to drag in the mistakes of the latter in vindication of his own position, even though Mr. Mansel "writes in defence of the current theology." Mr. Mansel's method is as far from the truth, and as antagonistic to true theology, as Mr. Spencer's. Having mentioned that Mr. Mansel has given preliminary definitions of the First Cause, of the infinite, and the absolute, Mr. Spencer quotes him as follows: "But these three conceptions, the cause, the absolute, the infinite, all equally indispensable, do they not imply contradiction to each other, when viewed in conjunction, as attributes of one and the same being? A cause cannot, as such, be absolute: the absolute cannot, as such, be a cause. The cause, as such, exists only in its relation to its effect; the cause is a cause of the effect; the effect is the effect of the cause. On the other hand, the conception of the absolute implies a possible existence out of all relation. We attempt to escape from this apparent contradiction by introducing the idea of succession in time. The absolute exists first by itself, and afterwards becomes a cause. But here we are checked by a third conception, that of the infinite. How can the infinite become that which it was not from the first? If causation is a possible mode of existence, that which exists without causing is not infinite; that which becomes a cause has passed beyond its former limits." By way of apprehending the real bearing of Mr. Mansel's implied contradiction, we will substitute analogous and more familiar terms for cause, absolute, and infinite, and see if the substituted terms suffer the same contradiction " these three conceptions, the artist, the man, the rational being, all equally indispensable, do they not imply contradiction to each other, when viewed in conjunction, as attributes of one and the same being? An artist, as such, cannot be man; the man, as such, cannot be artist." No doubt this appears absurd, but it is not one whit more absurd than Mr. Mansel's comparison. In this last the terms are clearly understood, and the reader sees at a glance the nonsense of the comparison. A proper conception of the terms cause, absolute, and infinite, will make Mr. Mansel's paragraph equally absurd. It is because Mr. Mansel has put his own contradictory and arbitrary meaning into the terms that he finds them so absurdly incongruous, and for the same reason Mr. Spencer quotes him. Mr. Spencer has told us what he means by the absolute, viz., that which exists out of all necessary relation to external beings and without any necessary relation within itself ("First Principles," section 12, page 38); or (to concede as much as possible to him), the Absolute is that which exists

"in the absence of all other existences." If the Absolute be that which can only exist in the absence of all other existences, then it must be conceded that the Spencer-Mansel absolute can never be a cause, and we may at once admit that the two notions are incompatible. If it be necessary for the existence of the Absolute that no other being should exist, then we grant Mr. Mansel's inconceivable. But such an absolute is an absurdity, and to couple it with the idea of First Cause breeds contradiction. The proper term is not absolute in the sense which Mr. Mansel and Mr. Spencer have given it, but independent being. They have confused the two. Absolute in its proper sense means independent being, and Mr. Spencer in spite of himself has described it as such, for he concludes the paragraph wherein he has discussed the absolute freedom of the First Cause from external and internal relations in these words: "Or, to use the established word, it (First Cause) must be absolute." We have already seen that an independent being does not necessarily imply a being which *can only* exist in the absence of all others, and that an independent being must be conceived as one in which at the same time there exists "nothing—which determines change, and yet nothing which prevents change;" and we have also seen that such an incongruous consociation of ideas is Mr. Spencer's arbitrary assumption of an inconceivable, and not the true metaphysical conception. His absolute, then, really means independent. What incompatibility exists, therefore, between an independent being and the First Cause? The fact that it causes does not restrict its independence, as we have already seen. On the contrary, the contingency and dependence of its effects upon the First Cause heightens and defines more clearly our notion of its independence, for they can or cannot exist at the fiat of its will. It is true that there exists a relation between the First Cause and its effects, but this relationship adds nothing to, and takes nothing from, the First Cause, since the relationship is founded in the *creatureship* of the created. It arises from the *dependence* of the effect upon its cause, without which that effect could never have sprung into being, and upon which the effect, as long as it exists, *absolutely depends* for the continuance of its being. The effect gives no new entity to the cause, but, on the contrary, the cause gives total entity to the effect. The only novelty is the existence of the effect. Its existence constitutes on its side the relation of *total dependence* upon its cause, from which it receives everything. The cause must precontain in some way, and supereminently if First Cause, its effect; if then the creation of the effect could add anything to its cause, we would have the following absurdity, viz., a cause receiving from its effect what that cause never had; but the effect can only be what it is, inasmuch as it receives from its cause what it has; how, then, can the effect give to its cause that

which it had not? Nothing, therefore, can be in reality added to the cause by the creation of its effect.

If we are to accept the absolute as that which must necessarily exist in the absence of all other beings, we fall into the absurdity, as Mr. Spencer implicitly does, of conceiving an absolute which is dependent and coerced by a mere possibility; "the First Cause," says Mr. Spencer (if it is to be conceived at all, he understands), "must be in every sense perfect, complete, total: including within itself all power, and transcending all law. Or, to use the established word, it must be absolute." *An absolute which can only exist provided no other beings exist*, is no absolute, since that would force it into dependency upon the *possibility* that no other beings exist. How, then, can it be "perfect, complete, total, and including within itself all power, and transcending all law?" It is in this misconception on the part of both Mr. Spencer and Mr. Mansel of the true Absolute that their fallacy is to be seen. Here, as elsewhere, the contradiction is engendered by consociating incompatible concepts which were never meant to agree. The Absolute is not to be conceived as that which necessarily exists out of all relation to external beings other than itself; but the Absolute is truly that which exists entirely independent of all other beings, which are its effects, and the creatures of its will. When, then, we conceive the Absolute, it is not to be thought of as a being, which can only exist on the contingency that others do not exist, but exists whether they do or not. No wonder we find wretched contradictions in an unknowable manufactured to order, and fashioned to fit preconceived inconceivables. It is not strange that Mr. Spencer finds the First Cause unknowable, when at the start he makes it inconceivable.

Mr. Mansel's next step is to prove the inconceivability of the First Cause for the reason that we must conceive it to be a conscious Being, and to conceive it as such, he argues, is a contradiction. "Consciousness is only conceivable as a relation. There must be a conscious subject, and an object of which he is conscious. The subject is a subject to the object; the object is an object to the subject; and neither can exist by itself as the Absolute." Without quoting further we understand that Mr. Mansel's argument lies in the distinction between subject and object. There must, then, exist this distinction in the self-conscious Absolute. Here, therefore, we have a distinction in the Absolute which proves fatal; either the subject is absolute, or the object. If either, then the other is not the Absolute. If both are absolute, then we have two absolutes, which is a contradiction. In the first place, there is an assumption that consciousness implies a distinction which is real, viz., that the thinking of self either creates another self or an objectivity which is not self. As Mr. Mansel puts it, "the

object of consciousness, whether a mode of the subject's existence or not, is either created in and by the act of consciousness, or has an existence independent of it." In the first place, Mr. Mansel would implicitly apply a mode to the Absolute which cannot be permitted to him. To speak of the Absolute as having or being a mode of itself, is of course a contradiction. Our conception of the Absolute must explicitly eliminate all modes. It is to be denied that the object of consciousness is either created in and by the act of consciousness, or has, therefore, an existence independent of it. This is a pure assumption on Mr. Mansel's part, and lacks proof. When I conceive myself, or am self-conscious, the act by no means makes another self, distinct from or existing beyond myself. On the contrary, in order that I may be self-conscious the *ego* must already exist, and so far from creating myself by being self-conscious, I could not be self-conscious unless the *ego* already be. When I conceive myself in thought, if that be Mr. Mansel's self-conscious, I but make a logical distinction, a distinction *in thought* and not *in reality*. Much more, then, is the identity complete when we think of the Absolute, between whom and his thought there is not even this logical distinction, for his thought is himself. When we think of the Absolute we must conceive him to be absolutely himself without even logical distinction within himself; and while self-consciousness in a finite being implies logical distinction, though not real distinction or *in re*, self-consciousness in the infinite necessarily excludes even logical distinction. Instead, then, of finding an antagonism in the consciousness of the Absolute, the contradiction, like all the Spencer-Mansel inconceivables, arises from an endeavor to conceive the Absolute under concepts which it necessarily and absolutely repudiates. Instead of attempting to conceive the Absolute as a being plus that which is in direct conflict with it, in order to gain a proper conception of it, he must conceive it as in every sense "perfect, complete, total," minus all that which limits its omnipotence and its all-perfectness; in short, we must conceive it as infinite. But if we attempt to think of it as infinite and finite, which is the Spencer-Mansel method, we naturally strike on a contradiction. And this arises from the fact that we are not conceiving it properly, but striding our conception of the First Cause with notions repugnant to it.

Mr. Spencer's whole difficulty flows from a double misconception; firstly, he confuses the proper conception of the infinite with an element in what is called the process of removal, whereby the finite arrives at its conception of the First Cause. The human intellect reaches the First Cause by reasoning back from effects to cause, and then, on the principle that the cause must in some way precontain its effect, it conceives that cause to possess, not formally, be it noted, whatsoever perfections are perceived in the effect.

The effect is finite ; therefore with limited perfection ; the First Cause is infinite, therefore without limitation, and hence all perfect. The perfection of the Infinite must then be conceived as transcending all limits. But since the First Cause must contain all perfection to infinity, it stands to reason that it cannot contain the perfection of the finite formally, that is as the finite does. Our conception of the perfection of the First Cause contains three elements : first, that the First Cause possesses whatsoever perfection the finite does ; secondly, that its perfection is beyond all limits, or infinite ; and thirdly, that we can only conceive that perfection *analogically*, that is, we conceive the First Cause as possessing all those perfections which its effects do, yet not in the degree or kind in which they do, but transcending their imperfection infinitely. We may aid ourselves by an illustration, which of course falls short of the reality. An artist preconceives his statue and fashions it after the idea he has formed in his mind. While the statue possesses a perfection which the artist gives it, still it is not the same in kind or degree as the perfection in the artist's mind ; the artistic prototype is in the intellectual order, and its expression in the material, and the one excels the other in perfection as the ideal excels the physical. As from the statue, which is effect, we can argue back to the artist's conception, so from effects we can argue back to the First Cause and glean some notion of its perfection. In none of these three elements is there the contradiction which Mr. Spencer advocates. That the First Cause possesses whatsoever perfection its effects do, in this there can certainly be no repugnance ; that the First Cause possesses them to infinity must be true, for it could not be the First Cause if it did not. And just here comes in Mr. Spencer's misconception. He, as well as Mr. Mansel, mistakes the negative conception of the First Cause, *not* holding the perfections of the finite as the finite does under limitations, with the positive conception of the infinite possessing these perfections transcendently. The act of the mind here is to first deny limitations to the infinite, that is, negative the negation, which restricts the finite, and so take away the imperfection which makes the finite to be what it is. It then conceives the infinite as possessing all these perfections, which are the positive element in the human mind's thought, and moreover so transcendently that these perfections must be conceived through analogy with finite effects. This, the proper conception of the First Cause, is free from all contradiction. Mr. Spencer only argues a contradiction when he confuses the negative with the positive concept, and so asserts that we conceive the infinite under the limitations of the finite.

Mr. Spencer's second misconception takes its source from the confusion of the inconceivable with the incomprehensible. The inconceivable, as he uses the term, means that which is contrary to reason ;

but the incomprehensible should mean that which is above reason. Now the First Cause is undoubtedly incomprehensible in its own essence, and beyond the conception of the finite mind. No created intellect can adequately comprehend the infinite. But this is a very different thing from not *apprehending* it at all. It is certainly within the grasp of the finite intellect to conceive the infinite inadequately, but because it does not grasp the infinite fully, it does not follow that its conception is a contradiction. When Mr. Spencer cites Sir William Hamilton as enumerating various "thinkers of note," who have held and advocated this doctrine of the inconceivable, both make the fatal blunder of supposing these thinkers to mean inconceivable in its strict sense, whereas they really meant incomprehensible, that which is *above* human reason, not contrary to it. Mr. Spencer cannot adequately comprehend the tiniest mote that floats in a sunbeam, yet what comprehension he has of it is not contradictory because, forsooth, he does not grasp it in its totality.

After his elaborate attempt to convince the reader that the First Cause implies contradiction in its conception, that it is "rigorously inconceivable," and that any hypothesis respecting the ultimate cause is "even unthinkable," what is our surprise to find Mr. Spencer endeavoring to demolish his own painfully constructed argument in the latter half of his chapter on "The Relativity of All Knowledge." After having approvingly quoted Mr. Mansel and Sir William Hamilton in favor of his doctrine, he turns and repudiates their reasoning, telling us "that there remains to be stated a qualification, which saves us from that skepticism otherwise necessitated!" Plainly, then, Mr. Spencer admits that his doctrine of the inconceivable leads to a skepticism, the burden of which he is not willing to take on his own shoulders. Skepticism, he sees, ends in absurdity, and so would involve him in a self-stultification. But he must escape from this "intolerable contradiction," and so he substitutes "a qualification" which serves him as does a plank a drowning man. Mr. Mansel's and Sir William Hamilton's "propositions are imperfect statements of the truth, omitting, or rather excluding, as they do, an all-important fact." What, now, is this all-important fact which makes the foregoing argument "an elaborate suicide," as Mr. Spencer characterizes it, and, at the same time, saves him from the absurdity of skepticism? Let us listen to Mr. Spencer himself: "Besides that *definite* consciousness of which logic formulates the laws, there is also an indefinite consciousness which cannot be formulated." What this indefinite is we will let Mr. Spencer himself say. "The error" (namely, of philosophers, like Sir William Hamilton, who are bent on demonstrating the limits and conditions of consciousness) "consists in assuming that consciousness contains *nothing but* limits

and conditions, to the entire neglect of that which is limited and conditioned ; the abstraction of these conditions and limits is, by this hypothesis, the abstraction of them *only* ; consequently, there must be a residuary in consciousness of something which filled up the outlines ; and this indefinite something constitutes our consciousness of the non-relative or absolute. Impossible though it is to give this consciousness any quantitative or qualitative expression whatever, it is not the less certain that it remains with us a positive and indestructible element of thought." Mr. Spencer has been arguing with Sir William Hamilton that "to think is to condition ;" hence, to think of the Absolute is to condition it, and thence arises the contradiction of a conditioned unconditioned. Mr. Spencer now asserts that there remains, in spite of this, a consciousness that there is some indestructible and positive element in thought, which rescues the mind from complete skepticism, notwithstanding the contradiction which the "*laws of thought*" force upon us. This positive element is an "indefinite something" which "constitutes our consciousness of the Absolute," and it suffers "no qualitative or quantitative expression whatever." Again he says : "The continual negation of each particular form and limit simply results in the more or less complete abstraction of all forms and limits, and so ends in an *indefinite consciousness* of the *unformed* and the *unlimited*." And this is the Absolute which is to save Mr. Spencer from the shipwreck of skepticism ! A formless, vague abstraction, an indefinite consciousness of *something* !

Mr. Spencer's Absolute is nothing more than the indeterminate idea of being, which he reaches in ascending the categories by successive abstractions from the particular until he gyrates upwards into the dizzy transcendental being, that "indestructible" element, that "positive" something, which remains in spite of all laws of thought ! Truly, this is a wonderful generation, an evolution worthy of Mr. Spencer's acumen, more miraculous than spontaneous generation, from the indeterminate, indefinite, vague, formless concept of being in general to create an Absolute "in every sense perfect, complete, total ; including within itself all power, and transcending all law !" This, then, is that "ultimate reality" behind all phenomena, that "infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed !" This is the mysterious reality which we are to regard as the cause of all things, and of which Mr. Spencer can only think with reverence and humility, if he thinks at all.

This is the transcendent infinite, for the mentioning of which as a conscious being, who cares for and loves the creatures of his own making, Mr. Spencer so bitterly castigates theologians. It seems singular that Mr. Spencer should fall into such an animated and vigorous speech over his unknowable, when, according to

his own teaching, it is like nothing in the waters under the earth, nor anything in the heavens above the earth, nor aught that is on the earth; of which all predication fails; which is neither conscious nor unconscious, being nor non-being, loving nor unloving, good nor bad; for all epithets alike are meaningless when applied to it. If, then, we should even call it a liar and a deceiver, where would be the impiety? If we should say that it is supremely evil, where the wrong, since our words have no meaning? If it has given us intellects to know the truth, and then forever withholds the truth from us, what wrong in cursing it for the deception it duly practices upon us, holding us but as its playthings and in implacable cruelty torturing us with an omnipresent riddle which we must ever seek to solve, and ever fail? Did Fijian or Indian ever torture his victim with more fiendish malice than this barbarous unknowable? This is the mystery, to keep which alive in man's grateful mind is the sole function of religion. This the object of adoration and reverence and belief (?), whence are to be drawn all consolations, all inspiration and aids to right-doing. The veriest fetich worshipper, who fancies his god to reside in the stick which his own hand has carved, renders a worship purer, more rational, higher, and more dignified a thousand times, incomparably, than all Agnostics together, who, in the arrogance of their conceit, would erect temples, richer than Solomon's, to this vague, formless, indefinite abstraction of their own vapid intellects.

Mr. Harrison has decidedly the advantage over Mr. Spencer in this matter of religious worship. He has accepted the latter premiss of the unknowable, and argued it out to its legitimate conclusion, wherein all religion evaporates into such rhetoric as Mr. Harrison wittily disperses over his pages. Mr. Harrison is logical at least, when he accepts the fatal doctrine of the unknowable, for it necessarily ends in that "ghost of religion," humanity! The flaw of both lies in the adoption of the absurdity which Mr. Spencer has laid down in the beginning, an utterly inconceivable god, which the human mind annihilates in its attempt to think of it. Neither humanity nor the unknowable can ever be the proper object of religious worship. Mr. Spencer rightly rejects Mr. Harrison's folly of humanity, and Mr. Harrison properly repudiates Mr. Spencer's absurdity of the unknowable. Both are *simulacra*, engendered by "persistent misconception along certain defined grooves of thought." Reason, so far from being exalted, is debased by the acceptance of either. Man's only dignity consists in having come from God, who has created him to know Him, the Truth. And "I, for one, cannot think there is such a radical vice in the constitution of things" as to suppose that man's intellect was made to conceive the highest truth a lie.

THE WAGE QUESTION.

SOME years ago, when the "labor question" had not nearly acquired the prominence it now has, a thoughtful writer declared that in the near future the chief contentions in society would not be so much about political institutions and civil rights as about the relations and respective rights of employers and employees. The present state of things in Europe and in this country fully verifies this prediction. The subjects about which the people, as a whole, are most deeply concerned are not political, but industrial. In England, and Scotland, and Ireland there has been an extension of the right of suffrage, yet this concession to a million or more of persons who previously had no voice in electing members of Parliament and shaping the political policy of Great Britain created only a slight ripple on the surface of public opinion and was accepted without excitement and without any special manifestation of gladness or rejoicing by the industrial classes, to whom it was extended.

They are more deeply concerned about their material condition, about the wages they receive and the securing of permanent and remunerative employment, than whether or not they have the right to vote at elections for members of Parliament or for county or municipal officers.

So, too, in Germany and in France, the majority of the people of those countries concern themselves far less about the political institutions under which they live than about the questions which immediately relate to their industrial condition and the securing of the largest and most certain return for their daily labor.

The same fact confronts us in this country. Convince the voter in the United States that the placing of any political party in power would add twenty-five cents per day to his wages without any increase of time or of the work he is required to do, and the popular vote would immediately turn in favor of that party.

It is plainly the industrial question, in one or another of its forms, that determines how both employers and employees, or, as they are commonly styled, capitalists and workingmen, shall cast their votes. The questions about duties on imports from foreign countries, about a tariff or a free-trade policy, the questions connected with our shipping and commercial interests, our railroads and our banking interests, our national debt and the manner of paying it, the questions about the rights and powers of corporate

companies and the extent to which those rights and powers should be limited, and like questions, all turn upon the manner in which the different policies proposed by opposing parties will affect the interests of capitalists and wage-payers on the one hand and those of workingmen or wage-workers on the other. The wage question, or, in other words, the question how wage-workers may assert and maintain their rights as against wage-payers, has practically become *the* question of our age.

In the thoughts which we propose to present on this subject we have no intention to attempt to discuss the relation of capital and labor in the abstract. Countless such disquisitions have been written and published, yet seemingly to very little purpose. We doubt whether they have ever really influenced, to any important extent, the action either of employers or of employees in the conflicts which are constantly occurring between them.

The question of wages is a practical one. It cannot and will not be solved by references to abstract principles of political economy or social philosophy, but by concrete facts. It is a question, too, which has become the question of the day in its relation to all temporal or material interests.

This may seem to some persons a very mercenary way of looking at the subject. Yet it is not. At least it is the natural way, and the way the subject is actually looked at by the vast majority of persons. "All that a man hath he will give for his life," and where wife and children are also concerned, he will give it all the more readily. It is mere mockery to concede to a man the right to go to the polls and vote for or against candidates for offices, whilst he himself is virtually a pauper living from hand to mouth, and dependent on the will of his employer whether he and his family shall have bread to eat or not.

The right to live, and to live as a being endowed with reason and will should live, comes first in the natural order. Political rights follow both in the order of nature and of relative importance. Political rights, too, are simply means to secure certain ends, and one of these ends is that of protecting the weak against the strong, the feeble many against the powerful few, in the efforts of the former to secure a certain and a decent livelihood.

We are well aware that many persons will probably dissent from these statements when made in the broad and naked manner in which we have put them. Yet facts of every-day occurrence around us prove their truth. The attempts made from time to time to organize a "labor party" in the United States are all based upon the belief that the "wage question" is of greater practical importance to those who work for wages than any question

of politics which divides the people of the United States into Republicans and Democrats.

These continual attempts to form a labor party may be well-advised or ill-advised; but whichever they be, the attempts themselves show that in the minds of those who make them the wage question dwarfs and subordinates to itself all mere political questions.

And, to adduce evidence of much wider range, it is an indisputable fact that of the many millions of persons who have migrated to this country from Ireland, Germany and other European countries, the vast majority sought our shores less from political reasons than from the hope of improving their material and industrial condition. It was not—at least not chiefly—because they had few or no political rights or privileges in their native countries, but because their labor was poorly recompensed and they hoped to better their condition, in this respect, in the United States.

The truth of this statement is confirmed by the fact that many of these emigrants cherish the hope of returning to their native countries as soon as they can acquire a competency sufficient to enable them to live there in comfort. Moreover, it is a fact that thousands of the native-born citizens of the United States, if remunerative employment and personal safety are assured to them, are willing and ready to leave this country and go to foreign countries, with little or no concern for the differences which such action will make in their political rights and privileges.

Were other proof needed of the prominent position which the wage question now occupies, it would be furnished by the rapidity with which associations of "trades-unions" of various kinds have been organized, and the vast numbers of persons whom they have enrolled. There is scarcely any form of industrial activity in which the wage-workers have not formed one of these societies. Of late years, too, efforts have been made to combine all these associations together into a common confederacy or union. And these efforts seem to be succeeding. One form of this movement,—that of the "Knights of Labor,"—if recent statements respecting their numerical strength can be relied on, have upwards of three hundred thousand members on their rolls.

The wage question is confounded by some persons with communistic and socialistic theories. But this is a mistake. It is true that socialistic and communistic agitators endeavor to win over the wage-workers to their support. But they have met with little success thus far. It is also true that among the wage-workers there are some who are avowed socialists or communists. But the number of these is few. There is not only no necessary connection between the efforts of wage-workers to better their con-

dition, as regards wages and hours of work, and the crazy dreams of socialists and communists, but their fundamental ideas are antagonistic.

Communism aims at the abolition of individual ownership of property. Its leading idea is that individuals have no exclusive personal right in anything they possess; no right in fact to possess and enjoy anything exclusively; that of right there is no such thing as individual ownership, but that all things should be owned in common, and be distributed to individuals to use and enjoy according to rules and regulations of the entire community or of officials which the commune should elect and appoint. The phrase "property is robbery" states correctly the fundamental notion of communism.

Socialism contemplates such a reconstruction of human society that all human productive action shall be regulated by the State. It would make, were it carried into practical effect, each individual a mere atom of the entire social aggregate, having no rights apart from or independent of that aggregate, and without personal freedom or personal choice as to what he shall do, when he shall work, or to what use the fruits of his labor shall be put.

But the wage question contemplates nothing of this kind. Its fundamental intention is summed up in the phrase, "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work." It does not aim at robbing employers of even a single dollar of property which they have individually acquired. It does not deny to them the right of increasing their possessions fairly and honestly, and without injustice, fraud, or oppression of their employees.

Taken as a whole, wage-workers have no sympathy with socialistic or communistic theories. Wage-workers are just as anxious to acquire individual property as are wage-payers; just as anxious to have houses and lands of their own, which shall be homes for them and their families; just as anxious to lay up money "against a rainy day," and enough of it to enable them to live comfortably and raise their children decently, and give them a fair start in life when they have grown up.

There are exceptions to this, of course; but these exceptions do not affect the truth of what we have said. Wage-workers look at the subject in a practical way. They know that their labor is the active producing cause of the wealth their employers acquire, and they feel that it is but just that their labor should be fairly compensated.

Until a few years ago, the wage question in the United States was one of easy practical solution in most cases. The demand for labor was such that if a wage-worker was dissatisfied with his work or with his wages, he could easily obtain other employment that

would remunerate him ; then, too, there was a constant movement from the position of wage-worker to that of wage-payer.

But this is no longer the case except to a very limited extent. The influx of emigrants from European countries, and the substitution of machinery for hand-work, have increased the supply of laborers beyond the demand for them. Consequently, when a wage-worker relinquishes a situation, or is discharged from it, he usually finds it very difficult to obtain work elsewhere.

Then, too, the rapid accumulation of capital in enormous amounts and the concentration of all our most important industries into the hands of a few persons or incorporated companies, closely united in syndicates or combinations, which exercise an irresistible power over individual action outside of these combinations, make it extremely difficult for wage-workers to exercise any influence, or to have any voice in deciding what wages they shall receive or how long they shall work. There is scarcely any mutuality between wage-workers and their employers. The wages which the former shall receive and the latter shall pay, is no longer a question for free discussion and free bargain and sale. The question is practically decided by the employers looking at the subject from their own point of view, and without reference to their employees, their condition, rights, or interests. The only liberty the wage-workers commonly can exercise, is the liberty of working or not working for the wages and on the terms which are prescribed by their employers.

Under these circumstances, a vast amount of the talk about wage-workers having a right and being free to put their own price upon their work, and to sell their labor or not as they may choose, is simply not pertinent to the question in the shape it has practically assumed. It is true in principle, but it is a principle which the vast majority of wage-workers are entirely unable to avail themselves of under existing circumstances. Naturally and in justice they have the right to exercise and enjoy this freedom, but, circumstanced as they are, they have not the power necessary to its exercise and enjoyment. The superior controlling power of combinations of capitalists and the needy condition of wage-workers unite to create this inability.

In the majority of instances, therefore, it is sheer mockery to say that wage-workers are free to accept or reject the terms and conditions that are proffered to them. As well say that the man who is loaded down with chains and shackles is at liberty to run—if he can. The man who yields up his money under the compulsion of a knife at his throat or a bludgeon brandished over his head, has no true freedom of choice or action. So, too, with the

wage-worker who receives wages prescribed to him under the condition that he accept those wages or starve.

We shall indulge in no rhetorical enlargement upon this truth. We simply state the naked fact. To us it appears to be as arbitrary and tyrannical an exercise of superior power as the act of a slave-owner who prescribes to his slaves the length of time they shall toil and the amount of work they shall do, without regard to their comfort, their health, and their strength.

The slave has the liberty of working or not working, subject to the penalty of being lashed and tortured if he refuses to work. In very many instances the wage-worker has like liberty, subject to the penalty of starvation or pauperism for himself and his family. If he refuses to accept the terms of his employer, the only alternatives left him are—to starve, to become a tramp, or a public pauper.

No one who looks actual facts squarely in the face and seriously considers them can controvert this statement or think that we have spoken too strongly. Our daily newspapers are constantly describing the manner of living and the wages paid to hundreds of thousands of wage-workers in our large cities and towns, and in mines and quarries in the country. Are these wage-workers actually *free* to sell their labor for the price they put upon it? Are they *free* to work or not to work for the wages paid by their employers? To ask these questions is to answer them.

Let us look at the actual facts of the wage question as it stands connected with some of the leading industries of Pennsylvania.

The mining of iron ore furnishes employment to a very large number of persons, and provides the raw material for one of our most important industries. What the actual condition is of the men who toil in those mines, and what wages they receive, may be inferred from the following remarks on the subject, made by the Secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania, in his official report upon the industries of the State:

“The mining of iron ore does not afford constant employment, the average amounting to but thirty-six weeks per annum. This allows scarcely sufficient wages per week, for the run of the year, to maintain a single individual. How those wage-workers having families to maintain can accomplish that difficult task is a problem in social economics that can be solved only by those who have been in similar circumstances. Many miners wear belts instead of suspenders to support the weight of their pantaloons, and one of these, in reply to the question asked him relative to his ability to buy food, replied: ‘Lord bless you, we don’t always eat when we are hungry, *we just tighten our belts.*’”

To show what is the average actual condition of the wage-workers in the iron-ore mines in Pennsylvania, we give two tables

taken from the official report on Industrial Statistics of Pennsylvania for the year 1884. These tables are not made up from returns from any particular mine, or from the mines of any particular locality, but by averaging the entire aggregate of returns from the whole State.

The first of these tables, entitled "Theoretical Wages," is an exhibit of the wages, per week and per year, of wage-workers in and about iron-ore mines, on the basis of constant employment during the whole year.

TABLE I.—*Iron-Ore Mines ; Theoretical Wages.*

Employees.	Daily Wages.	Weekly Wages.	Yearly Wages.
Miners,	\$1 25	\$7 50	\$390
Miners' helpers,	1 17	7 02	365
Engineers,	1 30	7 80	406
Foremen,	1 75	10 50	546
Blacksmiths,	1 40	8 40	437
Laborers,	95	5 70	296
Boys,	50	3 00	156
All others,	1 25	7 50	390

The foregoing exhibit is made up by tabulating returns made by the employers of labor in the iron-ore mines of Pennsylvania. But when this exhibit is tested and scaled down to the amounts actually paid by them to their employees, the figures reduce themselves to those contained in the following table :

TABLE II.—*Iron-Ore Mines ; Exhibit of Actual Wages.*

Employees.	Weekly Wages.	Annual Wages.
Miners,	\$4 50	\$270
Miners' helpers,	4 20	250
Engineers,	4 70	281
Foremen,	6 30	378
Blacksmiths,	5 04	302
Laborers,	3 41	205
Boys,	1 80	108
All others,	4 50	270

To explain more clearly how these tables have been made up we quote the statement respecting them of the Secretary of Internal Affairs for the State of Pennsylvania. He says :

"In the compilation of the tables of wages paid to wage-workers in Pennsylvania, we have deemed it proper to travel out of the beaten path. . . . Table I. shows the *highest* rates of wages paid per diem, multiplied by six full working days, to show the *highest* weekly wages, and this multiplied by fifty-two, to show the highest annual wages. Table II. gives the average daily wages, multiplied by the number of days *actually* employed per annum, and this product divided by fifty-two shows the actual weekly wages paid and received."

These tables show, by comparing them, how the general public are systematically deceived and deluded as regards the actual wages received by toilers in the iron-ore mines of Pennsylvania, and as regards their actual condition. Table II. tells the ghastly truth, and yet, not the whole truth. For even from the scanty wages exhibited in Table II. deductions are made for various reasons and pretexts not shown in the table. And while we are writing this, to-day's issue of a Philadelphia paper is before us, containing the statement that the present wages in the ore-mines of the most extensive iron-ore region in Pennsylvania are fifty cents per day, and sixty cents for experts.

Another of the leading industries of Pennsylvania, is that of mining coal. At different times, and according to the activity of the coal trade, it employs from 120,000 to 150,000 miners, laborers, and mechanics. The tables which we shall give below are taken from the official report on the industries of Pennsylvania for the year 1884. They have been prepared from the reports of operators who employed about 82,000 wage-workers in the anthracite coal-mines, and about 37,000 wage-workers in the bituminous coal-mines.

Respecting these tables the Secretary of Internal Affairs says :

"The great difference between theoretical wages and actual wages, is to be accounted for by the difference actually existing between theoretical working time and actual time employed. This difference amounts to one hundred and twenty-eight days in the anthracite, and one hundred and ten days in the bituminous coal-fields."

We first give the tables which exhibit respectively the theoretical and the actual wages in the anthracite coal regions :

TABLE I.—*Exhibit of Highest Average Wages in the Anthracite Coal Mines of Pennsylvania, Based on full Working Time.*

Theoretical Wages. Employees.	Day.	Week.	Year.
Miners on contract,	\$2 70	\$16 20	\$842 40
Miners on wages,	2 00	12 00	624 00
Laborers, inside,	1 78	10 68	555 36
Laborers, outside,	1 40	8 40	436 80
Boys,	65	3 90	202 80
Drivers and runners,	1 43	8 58	446 18
Firemen,	1 58	9 48	492 96
Engineers,	1 88	11 28	586 56
Blacksmiths,	1 91	11 46	595 92
Slate-pickers, boss,	1 55	9 30	483 60
Slate-pickers, boys,	50	3 00	156 00

Were this "theoretical" exhibit realized in actual fact by wage-workers in the anthracite coal-fields, there would be little reason

for complaint, and we are inclined to think that the wage-workers would not complain. But the table of actual wages, which we give below, shows that the foregoing table is simply a "word of promise to the ear, but broken to the hope."

Compare now with that table the one which follows :

TABLE II.—*Exhibit of Actual Wages at the Anthracite Coal Mines of Pennsylvania, Based on Actual Time Employed.*

Actual Wages. Employees.	Day.	Week.	Year.
Miners on contract,	\$2 70	\$8 84	\$459 68
Miners on wages,	2 00	7 00	364 00
Laborers, inside,	1 78	6 14	319 28
Laborers, outside,	1 40	4 91	255 32
Boys,	65	2 07	107 64
Drivers and runners,	1 43	5 32	276 64
Firemen,	1 58	5 73	297 96
Engineers,	1 88	8 84	459 68
Blacksmiths,	1 91	7 16	372 32
Slate-pickers, boss,	1 55	5 60	291 20
Slate-pickers, boys,	50	1 70	88 40

By glancing from one to the other of these tables the vast difference between the "theoretical" and the actual condition, as regards wages, of the toilers at the anthracite coal-mines, will be seen.

To save the trouble of a laborious comparison we tabulate the differences, per week and per year :

TABLE III.—*Exhibit of Differences between Theoretical and Actual Wages, and Consequent Loss, per Week and per Year, at the Anthracite Mines of Pennsylvania.*

Employees.	Loss of Wages.	
	Per Week.	Per Year.
Miners on contract,	\$7 36	\$382 72
Miners on wages,	5 00	260 00
Laborers, inside,	4 54	236 08
Laborers, outside,	3 48	180 96
Boys,	1 83	95 16
Drivers and runners,	3 26	169 52
Firemen,	3 75	195 00
Engineers,	2 44	126 88
Blacksmiths,	4 30	223 60
Slate-pickers, boss,	3 70	192 40
Slate-pickers, boys,	1 30	67 60

In the bituminous coal regions a like discrepancy exists between the nominal or theoretical and the actual wages, as the following tables prove. They show, too, that the condition of wage-workers in the bituminous coal-fields is even worse than that of wage-workers in the anthracite coal-fields :

TABLE I.—*Exhibit of Highest Average Wages Paid in the Bituminous Coal Mines of Pennsylvania, Based on Full Working Time.*

Theoretical Wages. Employees.	Day.	Week.	Year.
Miners,	\$2 00	\$12 00	\$624 00
Laborers, inside,	1 75	10 50	546 00
Laborers, outside,	1 60	9 60	499 20
Mule drivers,	1 75	10 50	546 00
Blacksmiths,	2 00	12 00	624 00
Coke-oven chargers,	1 70	10 20	530 40
Coke-oven drawers,	1 65	9 90	514 80
Mine boss,	2 80	16 80	873 00
Carpenters,	1 75	10 50	546 00
Clerks,	2 25	13 50	702 00
Boys,	60	3 60	187 20

How woefully short of this "theoretical exhibit" are the actual wages of the workers in the bituminous coal-fields of Pennsylvania is shown by the table which immediately follows :

TABLE II.—*Exhibit of Actual Wages Paid in the Bituminous Coal Mines of Pennsylvania, Based on Actual Time Employed.*

Actual Wages. Employees.	Per Day.	Per Week.	Per Year.
Miners,	\$2 00	\$7 10	\$369 20
Laborers, inside,	1 75	6 30	327 60
Laborers, outside,	1 60	5 61	291 72
Mule drivers,	1 75	6 20	322 40
Blacksmiths,	2 00	7 20	374 40
Coke-oven chargers,	1 70	6 04	314 08
Coke-oven drawers,	1 65	5 68	305 36
Mine boss,	2 80	12 00	624 00
Carpenters,	1 75	7 00	364 00
Clerks,	2 25	10 00	520 00
Boys,	60	2 70	140 40

After examining this latter table, the fact must be considered that these "actual" wages are subject to various drawbacks and deductions enforced against employees, and which their necessitous condition compels them to submit to. These drawbacks and deductions amount to from twenty to twenty-five per cent. of wages that the employees are credited with upon their employers' books. When this fact is taken into consideration, it becomes evident that it is scarcely possible for the wage-workers to obtain for themselves and their families mere subsistence, not to speak of a decent and comfortable livelihood. There seems to be no opportunity or chance, even, of them rising above the condition of mere serfs, compelled to toil hopelessly during life, on the terms and conditions which their employers prescribe.

To show more clearly the discrepancy between the "theoretical" wages of employees in the bituminous coal-fields, as furnished by

employers, and published from time to time in our newspapers, and the actual wages (excluding, too, even, drawbacks and deductions commonly made from them), we give below a table compiled by the Secretary of Internal Affairs, exhibiting the losses incurred per week by wage-workers, owing to irregular employment. To this table we have added a column, showing from the same official figures the losses per year :

*Exhibit of Differences Between Theoretical and Actual Wages
Paid per Week [and per Year] in Bituminous Mines in
Pennsylvania.*

Employees.	Wages.	
	Loss per Week.	Loss per Year.
Miners,	\$4 90	\$254 80
Laborers, inside,	4 20	218 40
Laborers, outside,	3 99	207 48
Mule drivers,	3 30	223 60
Blacksmiths,	4 80	249 60
Coke-oven chargers,	4 16	216 32
Coke-oven drawers,	4 22	219 44
Mine boss,	4 80	249 60
Carpenters,	3 50	182 00
Clerks,	3 50	182 00
Boys,	90	46 80

By comparing this table of "losses" per week and per year of wage-workers in the bituminous coal regions in Pennsylvania, owing to irregular employment, with the table of actual wages credited them, a clearer idea will be obtained of their real condition. The brief comment of the Secretary of Internal Affairs upon this point contains a ghastly truth, the deep significance of which is well worth pondering over; "It must be confessed," he says, "that the weekly wages of Pennsylvania coal operatives is not calculated to admit of a saving fund against the day of sickness or disaster. . . . Looking at the result, and it is one that has been obtained after full and impartial investigation, we are forced to the conclusion that more steady and certain employment throughout the year to employees in the coal fields of Pennsylvania would be more beneficial to the wage-workers than would a nominal rise in daily wages. Not that we think that the present daily wages are sufficient, but rather that the daily wages paid under the present system of broken time is calculated to deceive the wage-workers themselves, who, for the most part, forget the past danger of uncertainty in their employments, and, with a generous hope, multiply their certain daily wages by a certain full time which, alas! never comes."

The space allowed us is limited, and this fact prevents us from going into details of the wages and condition of wage-workers in

other industrial pursuits of Pennsylvania. But, as bearing on the subject, and as containing statistics which are well worthy of careful study, we give the following tabulated exhibit of the average weekly wages of all wage-workers in the principal industries in Pennsylvania, compiled by the Secretary of Internal Affairs. The explanatory title of the table is:

An Exhibit of the Average Weekly Wages of all Wage-Workers in the Several Industries of Pennsylvania Named, Supposing the Annual Amounts of Wages Paid in each Industry were Divided Equally among all the Wage-Workers in the Special Industry from which the Annual Wage Fund is Obtained.

Industries.	Weekly Wages.	Industries.	Weekly Wages.
Agricultural implements,	\$ 8 00	Iron foundries,	\$11 40
Axes and saws,	8 80	Lasts,	7 75
Bessemer steel,	12 17	Milling, flour and grist,	5 04
Blast furnaces,	8 50	Malt,	8 80
Bloomeries,	8 12	Neckwear,	7 25
Brass foundries,	9 80	Ores, iron,	4 80
Boilers and engines,	8 56	Oilcloths,	5 17
Bridges,	9 00	Oil refineries,	7 00
Boots and shoes,	8 00	Paper,	7 15
Breweries,	12 00	Paints,	9 33
Bricks, common,	3 00	Planing mills,	8 00
Bricks, fire,	6 00	Potteries,	7 66
Brushes,	3 20	Rolling mills,	8 00
Carpets,	6 71	Sawmills,	5 29
Cigars,	7 08	Slate quarries,	6 10
Cotton cloth,	5 10	Sugar refineries,	9 25
Crucible steel,	11 00	Soap and candles,	8 20
Crucibles,	16 60	Show cases,	9 50
Cordage,	4 80	Silk,	4 00
Coal, anthracite,	6 91	Shirts,	5 00
Coal, bituminous,	7 20	Stoves and ranges,	11 00
Distilleries,	8 20	Tanneries,	7 50
Furniture,	8 75	Trunks,	8 00
Glass, window,	11 50	Toys,	3 64
Glass, flint and green,	8 00	Terra cotta,	9 80
Glass, sand,	5 80	Type foundries,	5 43
General machinery,	9 25	Umbrellas and parasols,	6 04
Hats and caps,	4 00	Upholstery goods,	6 16
Harness,	8 00	Woollen goods,	5 40

With regard to this table the Secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania says:

"The general average of the above would be (if we take into consideration the proportion of employees to the industries named in the table) about seven dollars and a half per week. This sum will not permit of any extravagant habits, and any diminution of it must inevitably compel the average wage-worker to abstain from the purchase of those necessities of life which, at the time, seem

most convenient to dispense with. To lessen the wages of a body of wage-workers is, in effect, to cause an 'over-production,' so called, of manufactured products, since the average wage-worker, in order to meet the requirements of nature and those wants incident to his station in life, must, in the event of a reduction of wages, either go in debt and satisfy those wants, or economize, and, consequently, leave the manufactured or other product in the hands of the dealer; hence an over-production, which is but the result of an enforced under-consumption."

A few more brief comments on the volume before us, and we reluctantly dismiss it. The Secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania has, with much pains and labor, compiled various tables comparing the differences in condition as regards wages, cost of food, house rent, etc., of wage-workers in Pennsylvania and in European countries. After an exhaustive comparison of the facts and tables of cost of food which he gives, the conclusion is that the English, and Scotch, and Irish wage-worker lives at less expense for food, and food which better maintains his physical strength, than does the wage-worker in the United States.

It may be our climate; it may be wrongly-cultivated tastes and desires; but whatever be the cause, it seems to be *necessary* for the wage-worker in the United States, in order to keep up the muscle and energy required for his work, to consume more expensive food than in England, Scotland, Ireland, or any other trans-Atlantic country.

So, too, as regards house-rent, fuel, clothing, and medical attendance. As regards fuel, the wage-workers in England and Scotland usually get it at a nominal sum, merely covering the actual cost of delivery. In the United States the full market price, or more than that, is charged. The average house-rent charged for tenements in our coal regions is five dollars per month, a rent-charge which is equal to from twenty to forty per cent. annually upon the actual cost. And that the discomfort to which wage-workers are subject as regards their dwellings is not owing to their wilful neglect, the Secretary of Internal Affairs testifies as follows: "The majority of wage-workers in Pennsylvania live in houses . . . that, in most cases, are clean, and bearing evidence of good management by tidy housewives."

Another element of the wage-question is commented upon in the volume before us. It is that of "Company Stores and Store Orders." We condense the remarks on this subject. "Operators, in many instances, report the amount of wages paid wage-workers as actual money paid them, when the facts would warrant them in reporting fully two-thirds of the amount as *groceries* and *provisions* paid in lieu of money. . . . The system of 'company stores'

robs the wage-workers of an amount of money it is impossible to calculate, but enough is known to warrant the inference that he who, forced by circumstances, is obliged to accept store orders or deal at the 'company store' is at the mercy of his employer."

And just this system of accepting orders on the "company's store" in lieu of wages, is generally enforced by employers on their employees throughout both the anthracite and the bituminous coal regions. It is forbidden by legislative enactments, but those enactments are defied or evaded. One of the methods for doing this, and one which operates most disadvantageously to wage-workers, even where the "company store" system does not exist, is the practice of withholding wages for the period of a month before payment. That wages could be paid at shorter intervals, without detriment to employers, is proved by the fact that in England they are usually paid "once a week," or "once a fortnight." With regard to this, the Secretary of Internal Affairs makes the following significant remark:

"The rule in Pennsylvania is to withhold the bulk of the wages for a period of one month before paying, and, in some cases, a certain percentage of wages is withheld as a guarantee fund against the violation, on the part of the miners, of certain iron-clad contracts, so-called, framed to evade laws passed for the better protection of miners."

"In this same connection, and as having a direct relation to our subject, we quote the following statement of the Secretary of Internal Affairs:

". . . . From the reports made of difficulties, antagonisms, and strikes, it would appear that little real harmony exists between the employer and the employed. Capital [*Capitalists* would be more accurate] too often regards the laborer with little or any more consideration than a beast of burden, while the laborer, too often with justice, esteems the employer, if not an absolute oppressor, yet as often wanting in human feeling toward him. That such a state of things should exist is unfortunate, but a careful examination of the question renders such conclusion imperative."

In further evidence of who are chiefly to blame for the existing antagonisms between wage-payers and wage-workers, according to the opinion of the Secretary of Internal Affairs, we quote the following statements:

"From statistics and reports received, the following conclusions have been reached:

"That the wage-worker, as a rule, is frugal, temperate, and industrious. The amount of wages paid does not admit of intemperate or improvident habits.

"That the present amount of wages annually paid does not give

to the wage-worker comfortable means of support and enable him to lay by even a moderate fund to meet the necessary exigencies he is almost certain to encounter.

"That wage-workers receive in wages *one-third less* than is generally accredited to them, owing to the fact that the accredited wages per diem are not the average for computation throughout the year, without due allowance is made for unemployed time. *Enforced idleness* is more disastrous than the low rate of wages.

"That . . . steady and certain employment is more important to the wage-worker than a nominal advance in per diem wages."

"An evil growing out of present conditions is shown by the increase of child-labor, and this *cannot be prevented* until the head of the family is enabled by his own labor to earn an *adequate support*.

"The great mass of the community is composed of wage-workers. It is essential to the present and future welfare of the State that labor should be justly and adequately paid.

"It is the true interest of the employer as well as of the employee, and it should be the aim of the employer, not only to pay just wages to the extent of his ability, but also to protect the employees from casualties to life and limbs, so often occurring by reason of the neglect of proper safeguards."

These are the conclusions not of a wage-worker in the technical sense of the word, but rather of an employer, after a careful survey of the whole field of industrial labor in Pennsylvania and possessed of the best possible means of accurate information. In view of the facts and statistics we have presented (and they are but a small part of what we might exhibit), it seems evident to our mind that the reason why the wage question is a source of constant strife and contention, instead of amicable adjustment, lies chiefly at the door of employers rather than of employees. This remark, too, holds good with respect to the United States generally. For while we have confined our statistical statements to Pennsylvania, yet if the view be extended to our country as a whole, it will be found that wage-workers in Pennsylvania are, to say the least, in no worse condition than in other States.

Between capital and labor, strictly speaking, there is not and cannot be antagonism. Both enter into and are conjoined inseparably in every form of human industry. The one is the product of the other, and neither can prosper separately. But this is aside from the real practical question. While *capital* and *labor* are not antagonistic, it is a fact of every-day experience that *capitalists* and *laborers* are constantly in antagonism.

It is unfortunate, and not only unfortunate but wrong, that this

should be the case. For owing to it both classes suffer, and society at large, which is almost entirely composed of them, also suffers.

The real practical question, therefore, is, at whose door lies the wrong? And if both are in the wrong, to what extent and in what way?

The discussion of these questions would open up another and a very interesting branch of the general subject, which limitation of space forbids us entering upon.

There are however some important facts bearing on the subject which, though little thought of, are so well known, that we need adduce no proof of them, but simply state them.

The duties of wage-workers in their relation to wage-payers, to themselves, and to society are preached *ad nauseam* from press and pulpit. They are told that they should be temperate, patient, contented, respectful, honest, and just, and that they should consider and strive to promote the interests of those from whom they receive wages. If they violate those duties they are summarily denounced, their shortcomings, their unreasonable demands, their inconsiderate disregard of their employer's position or necessities with reference to his business, their rash acts of violence to persons or property, are swiftly exposed and unsparingly denounced.

But there is singular reticence with regard to equally censurable violations of duty when committed by employers. That side of the case is seldom depicted, and when it is it is done usually in colors so faint and indistinct that it attracts little attention. The public press seldom alludes to it, nor does the pulpit, and when they do the reference is so general that its point and special application are unfelt.

A glaring example of this is furnished by the manner in which the public press practically ignores notorious frauds upon wage workers which are constantly practiced by coal operators and other capitalists, and by incorporated companies, with regard to weights and measures employed in determining the amount of work done by employees. Scales are so manipulated, and mine cars of falsely reported capacity are employed to reduce by ten, twenty, or thirty per cent. the amounts of wages which the employees have fairly earned, and which should be placed to their credit. If butchers or farmers are caught selling fifteen ounces of beef or butter for a pound, or retailers of dry-goods in measuring off calico at the rate of thirty inches for a yard, they quickly suffer the penalties of the law, and are regarded by the public as common cheats and scoundrels. But year by year frauds of far greater extent are practiced, notoriously, in our coal regions by coal operators and mining companies without detriment to the social standing of the

operators, nor of the presidents and directors of those companies, and without their being made amenable in any way to law.

The complaints of the miners against this practice were so earnest that some years ago a law was enacted in Pennsylvania prohibiting it, and providing that the capacity of the mine cars should be ascertained and registered by a specially authorized officer, and that at each mine a "check-boss" or weighmaster might be appointed by the miners. But the penalties for disobeying the law are sadly defective. The law is notoriously disregarded. Yet we have never heard of a single instance in which the operators or owners of coal mines, or the presidents or directors of coal companies, or their superintendents, have been fined or imprisoned, or in any way punished for violating this law. Only a few days ago the operatives in the Clearfield and Broad Top coal region published a list of complaints, one of which was that the scales at the mines were so arranged that they showed less than the true weight of coal in each mine car. They declared that their check-boss or weight-inspector was not allowed to touch the scales, and that all he could do was to notice the apparent weight of the cars as they rapidly passed over the falsely-adjusted scales. At other mines there are no check-bosses, and at still others there are other means employed for cheating the miners, whether the quantity of coal mined and their resulting wages be determined by weight or by measure.

These facts are widely known. There is not a newspaper in Pennsylvania that is ignorant of them, yet how seldom are they alluded to, and when alluded to, in how pointless and deprecatory manner is not the allusion made? Yet the systematic, deliberative cheating of coal operatives that is thus perpetrated amounts yearly to at least a million dollars and probably to double that sum.

Then, again, the system of keeping back wages of employees for the period of at least a month, and of frequently, too, reserving wages to a certain amount, or for a certain period, as a forfeit against employees violating "iron-clad" contracts, operates—whether in all cases intended so to do or not—to cut down wages to an extent of from ten to twenty-five per cent., according to circumstances and localities.

On this subject the recent testimony of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, an employer of thousands of workmen, in a recent open letter published in many of our daily newspapers, is directly in point. He said that in an interview with a large body of his employees they declared that a reduction of the period of paying wages from four weeks to two weeks would be equivalent to an increase of more than five per cent. on their wages. It is needless to say that a reduction to one week would more than duplicate that percentage

of advantage to wage-workers. What gives all the more force to this testimony is that these employees are not compelled to purchase at "company stores," and are in a region where there is free competition among those from whom they procure their supplies.

The "company store" custom is a natural adjunct of this system of holding back wages. At the start of new mining operations in a secluded region there was a seeming justification for it. It was necessary that a store, or depot of supplies for the miners, convenient to the place where they worked, should be established. The individuals, or the company, operating the mines, it was argued, might as well establish the store and reap the profit from it as any one else. And the argument would be a sound one were it not for the temptations to abuse power and to exercise extortion, which experience shows the system involves. How great that abuse is, and the consequent extortion, is abundantly proved by the testimony which induced (*compelled* would, perhaps, more correctly express the truth) the Legislature of Pennsylvania to enact a prohibitory law against "company stores," as well as by the emphatic condemnation of them by the Secretary of Internal Affairs. But partly owing to defects in the law itself, and partly owing to its ineffective administration, growing out of the unwillingness of the officials whose duty it is to report and bring to justice the influential parties who disregard its provisions, it is evaded and defied to an extent that makes it virtually inoperative and dead.

Where stores are not publicly and avowedly established and maintained by "companies," or individual operators, they are virtually so, and have the same oppressive effect through operators being interested in them and receiving a percentage of the sales made to their employees. It is well understood, too, by the latter that unless they purchase their supplies at those stores they will be dismissed from employment, or, on one or another pretext, will have the most unremunerative work crowded over upon them.

Moreover, owing to the long periods that the scanty wages paid the operatives are kept back, the operatives must buy their supplies on credit. As they have no visible property which they can pledge as security, and as their wages are both scanty and precarious, the merchant, even if he have no understanding or connection with the operators, and even if he is a competitor of the company's store, puts a much higher price upon everything he sells to these miners, in order to cover the risk of losses which he incurs.

Thus wage-workers are crushed and ground beneath the upper and the lower millstone. On the one hand, they have to struggle against the tendency of employers to reduce their wages, and pay them just as little as will secure their services. On the other hand,

they have to pay higher prices for all their purchases than others who buy for cash in the open market.

These facts are perfectly well known to the writers for our newspapers and periodicals, yet few and faint are the censures pronounced upon the capitalists and companies who, for their own profit or convenience, impose these disadvantages and inflict these losses upon their employees. There are legislative enactments professedly framed to protect wage-workers from some of these abuses and methods of extortion, but they are lame and ineffective, and the controlling influence exerted by capitalists and corporations over those whose duty it is to enforce these legislative enactments practically nullifies even the little prohibitory force they have.

Under these circumstances it is not at all surprising that widespread dissatisfaction and discontent prevail among wage-workers. They feel that they are imposed on, cheated, and defrauded. They know that when trade becomes brisk and business profitable, they receive a tardy and scanty increase of wages, but when the profits of their employers are lessened, their wages are swiftly reduced.

As for the lawlessness and acts of violence of wage-workers, there are several things to be said in explanation—in explanation, but not in excuse or defence. For we can frame no apology for lawlessness.

The first of these remarks is that these acts are most frequently committed not by the wage-workers themselves, but by the “roughs and toughs and hoodlums” who, on every occasion of excitement or disturbance, are ready to take advantage of it and make it an opportunity for indulging their criminal propensities.

The second point we make is that it is not surprising if the wage-workers themselves are sometimes carried away by excitement and indignation into disregard of the requirements of the law. In the action of their employers whose exactions they are resisting and striking against, they have an example of successful evasion and defiance of law. They see that they disregard and defy numerous emphatic prohibitions of State Constitutions; that they openly evade and defy legislative enactments; that they resort to legal action when it is to their interest to do it, and that, at other times, they resist its action by employing the potent influences of wealth to bribe legislators, to control State and municipal officers, and to lame and paralyze the arm of the law when raised against corporations and capitalists in our courts of justice.

If, therefore, there is danger of wage-workers accepting the satanic gospel of disregard for law, it is because wealthy capitalists and corporations are teaching them that bad lesson, not by precept, but in the more effective and potent form of example.

The occurrences of the last few weeks or months furnish abun-

dant proof of this. Take, for example, the street passenger railways of Philadelphia. They were created for public convenience and benefit. For that reason, and that reason alone, special and extraordinary privileges were granted to them. They were permitted to occupy public streets, to the obstruction and disadvantage of other modes of travel and methods of transit and transportation. Certain specific conditions and restrictions were enacted which they were expected in good faith to perform and observe. Yet, it is a notorious fact that each and all of these corporations disregard and violate those conditions and limitations. They have taken possession of the public highways of the city, and they use them as though they were their own property, and in open disregard of the rights of all property owners along them. They were expected to supply and run a sufficient number of cars to comfortably transport the citizens who desired to use them. Instead of this, they run only such a number as will enable them to transport their passengers by crowding them together in solid masses in the passage way and on the platforms with the utmost discomfort, and often to the serious injury of health. Then, too, the conditions of their charters respecting the repairing of the streets through which their rails are laid, and respecting other matters, are notoriously violated as regards the intention and purpose of those conditions.

These plain evasions or defiant violations of law are systematically practised by the presidents and directors of these corporations; and are tacitly approved of by the stockholders—men who are leaders of society, influential citizens, and in many cases are members of Congress, of our State Legislature, of our Municipal Councils and occupants of other offices of high responsibility.

The second and last special instance we shall cite is that of the strike upon the Gould system of railroads in our Southwestern States. The particular grievances which caused this strike have not been specifically nor clearly placed before the public. Its immediate occasion was the discharge of one of the foremen of one of the repair shops of the Texas Pacific Railroad, which act was regarded by the Knights of Labor of that region as a blow struck at their whole society. But this was only the occasion of the strike. The underlying cause is alleged by the strikers to consist of arbitrary abuse of power on the part of the railroad officials and of unreasonable and oppressive conditions imposed by them upon the employees. The employees from the outset of the strike profess to be entirely willing to submit their alleged grievances to investigation and arbitration, but the railroad authorities stubbornly refuse to accede to this proposal.

The strike quickly extended to the Missouri Pacific Railroad and its branches (which connect with the Texas Pacific and furnish to it a large part of its traffic). The Governors of the four States

of Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas and Texas (the business of which States was most seriously and injuriously affected) intervened and proposed arbitration. But the proposal was unheeded by the officials of the railroads mentioned.

Then the "switchmen" of the East St. Louis railroad yards (which are the meeting point of all the railroads coming to St. Louis from the entire region of the United States east of the Mississippi River) also struck. The effect of this was to cut off St. Louis from its traffic with the East as well as with the Southwest. Yet still the railroad officials refused to listen to any terms of adjustment of the contention, save that of absolute and unconditional submission on the part of their employees.

The question has resolved itself into a question of power, viz., whether Jay Gould and his associates shall prescribe unconditionally, and without regard to the requirements of law or of justice, the terms on which their employees shall work, or whether the latter by their associated, united, strength shall be able to compel him to submit the questions at issue to fair and impartial arbitration.

We have excluded from this statement reference to the few instances of violence to property and persons which have occurred up to the time of our putting these thoughts on paper. The instances have been few, and it is alleged that the perpetrators of them were not strikers, but members of a disorderly mob of professed sympathizers, consisting of persons who are always ready to take advantage of occasions of public excitement to commit criminal acts.

In this respect the strike, up to the time of our writing these lines, is in marked contrast with the great railroad strike which some years ago extended over the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia. Then bridges, railroad cars and depots, and warehouses were burned, the civil and military power was set at defiance, and countless acts of violence to property and persons were perpetrated. But in this strike, up to the time of our writing, but one solitary instance of violent resistance of the civil power has been committed, resulting in the murder of several persons at Fort Worth, Texas. And in this instance, it is asserted by the strikers that the guilty persons were not strikers or Knights of Labor, but were men who were entirely independent of them and who acted upon their own personal lawless impulses.

Whether this be the truth, or not, it is certain that the leading officers of the Knights of Labor have earnestly and persistently counselled the members of the society to abstain from lawlessness and acts of violence. They have exhorted them to maintain patience under all circumstances and to employ only passive resistance to the obstinacy of their employers.

On the other hand, there are two points which stand forth prominently respecting this whole affair.

In the first place, the "deputy-sheriffs," or "guards," whom the railroad officials hired, were largely composed of roughs, skilled in the use of guns and revolvers, and accustomed to employ them on slightest provocation.¹ The result of this has been the reckless killing of six men and one woman for no other cause than that they were in a crowd of spectators who hooted and jeered at the "deputy sheriffs." The "railroad guards," or "deputy sheriffs," immediately fled across the Mississippi bridge. That the strikers and the excited populace of East St. Louis did not wreak vengeance, for this utterly unjustifiable slaughter, upon the railroad property and persons in its employ, was chiefly owing to the heroic exertions and impassioned appeals, patience, and respect for law, made by Mr. Hayes and Major Brown, members of the Executive Committee of the Knights of Labor. On the following night, a considerable amount of railroad property was destroyed by incendiary fires, but all the known facts lead to the conclusion that these fires were not kindled by the strikers, but by desperadoes who took advantage of the confusion and excitement to gratify their criminal propensities.

Our second remark is that there is good reason to believe that whatever decision is eventually reached as regards the questions at issue between the strikers and the railroad companies, Jay Gould and his associates are making money out of the strike. Whether the assertion be true or not, that they secretly promoted the strike, it is certain that, by the course they have pursued, they are prolonging it; and, by their manipulations of the stock market, while they keep, meanwhile, their own intentions and plans secret as regards the final settlement of the contention, it is easy to see that their gains through stock speculations will probably amount to far more than the losses they sustain through interruption of traffic over their railroads.

We conclude with the remark that it is futile for the public press to be constantly preaching platitudes respecting patience and regard for the rights of employers and respect for law, whilst the

¹ This has been denied by the railroad officials, but the following advertisement, extensively published, speaks for itself:

"LOUISVILLE AND NASHVILLE RAILROAD COMPANY.—OFFICE OF AGENT, April 6, 1886.—Ten good men from here are wanted as deputy marshals at East St. Louis, to protect Louisville and Nashville employees. Five dollars per day and board will be paid. Also, a number of platform-men can be given employment. Only men who have plenty of grit and mean business need apply. Apply at once.

"T. S. GENUNG, Agent."

The advertisement was quickly answered by men who had "plenty of grit" and "meant business;" and how they showed their "grit" and the horrible "business" they did, the sad sequel proves.

evasions and defiant violations, constantly practiced by mammoth capitalists and corporations, are ignored, condoned and tacitly approved.

We have said that wage-workers are not, as a class, lawless, nor infected with Socialistic and Communistic ideas, but how long this will continue to be the fact remains to be seen. Unless our mammoth capitalists and corporations learn and practice justice, fairness and consideration for their employees; unless they abstain from the illegal, unjust and extortionate measures of which they are notoriously guilty; unless they themselves respect and obey the law, we risk nothing in predicting that, before another generation comes upon the stage of active life, there will be, here in the United States, a social revolution that will involve indescribable confusion and destruction of property and of life.



THE DECREES OF THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL.

Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii, A.D. MDCCCLXXXIV. Praeside Illmo. ac Revmo. Jacobo Gibbons, Archiepiscopo Baltimorensi et Delegato Apostolico. Baltimoræ: Typis Joannis Murphy et Sociorum. MDCCCLXXXVI. 8vo. Pp. cix., 321.

HERE we have printed in large, readable type, on good paper, and with typographical accuracy, the Decrees of the late Plenary Council of Baltimore. The one hundred and five first pages are a preliminary to the Decrees themselves, comprising, as they do, the letters that passed between the Holy See, the Apostolic Delegate, and the Fathers of the Council, an account of each solemn session (five in all) and its ceremonial, and finally some extracts from the minutes of the private sessions. In the edition of the Second Plenary Council of 1867, the minutes of the private sessions were given almost entire. But, in the case of the Third Plenary, this would have been impossible. The duration of the Council, prolonged, as it was, from November 9th to December 7th, the great number of those sessions (generally twice a day), and the number of topics brought under debate, swelled the

minutes of the meetings to enormous dimensions. Even when they had been carefully pared down to bare essentials by the secretaries, with all the succinctness afforded by the Latin tongue, they covered over one hundred pages of print in the large quarto edition put in type for the benefit of the Roman examiners and consultors. In the few extracts, which it was thought expedient to give from these private sessions, regard was had to what might interest most the Catholic public, and also to points which might serve as legal precedents in future Councils.

Coming now to the Decrees themselves, the first (page 1) reminds clergy and people that the enactments of the Second Plenary (1867) remain yet in full vigor of law, and are binding on all, save inasmuch as they have been repealed, altered, or amended by the Council of 1884. The last Decree in the volume (*Titulus Ultimus*, as it is technically called), to remove all doubt, and to preclude any plea in excuse for negligence or delay, solemnly declares the present legislation to become of binding effect as soon as it shall have been promulgated by the Apostolic Delegate, the Archbishop of Baltimore. Nevertheless, it is recommended, for the sake of caution and greater solemnity, that the local promulgation for provinces and sees be made in Councils and Synods respectively, especially with a view to provide the best means of giving speedy and sure effect to the new legislation.

The second Title is the only one which concerns Catholic faith. It reverently adopts whatever the Vatican Council has defined touching Reason, Revelation, the Holy Scriptures, the Infallibility of the Pope when speaking *ex cathedra*; and condemns, in conformity with the decisions of the Holy See, the errors of socialism and communism, of statolatry or State-worship, and of those who from ignorance or malice are bent on rooting out from the popular mind the true idea of Christian marriage. This was by no means necessary; for all Catholics had years ago adhered to these definitions. But it was not out of place. Let it stand on the record as a witness of the loyalty of the American Church to Christ's Vicar on earth, which will condemn our children's children if ever they deliberately shut their eyes to the light and rise up in rebellion against the truth, as happened three hundred years ago. Let it stand there as a beacon and wholesome warning to remind those who are outside of the Church and yet glory in the name of Christian, that the Catholic Church is the only teaching body left that maintains unchangeably the reverence due to Scripture and its inspiration, and that defends, in defending Christian marriage and the sacred bond of the family, the last prop of human society and Christian civilization. Individuals hold the truth in many religious organizations, but others, to any number, of the same community

may hold the contrary with impunity. Hence as a body they do not teach even those truths which are necessary to hold society together; and if they did so teach, thousands would resent it as an attempt to fetter their Gospel liberty, while others would laugh at it as an impotent assumption of an authority which no one acknowledges, and which those now usurping it have disowned a thousand times. When a Catholic hears the voice of the teaching Church, he accepts it at once as the teaching of Christ or of His Apostles. No matter how high his station, how brilliant his gifts of intellect or rich stores of knowledge, he would no more think of rejecting that voice than would the humblest convert of Corinth venture to contradict to his face the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

After an exhortation to bishops to be more heedful of their true dignity, as representatives of Christ our Lord, than of the external pomp and state by which their office is surrounded, their duties of visitation of their flocks, and of the decennial visit *ad sacra limina*, are explained and inculcated by the Council. The mode of procedure, when the See is vacant, is then given. The consultors and irremovable rectors of the diocese must be called together for the purpose of fixing on three names to be presented to the bishops of the province as suitable candidates for the vacant see. One copy of their choice of names is to be sent to the bishops and another to Rome. Their vote is to be secret and consultive only. But such, too, is the vote of the bishops. They only present the names, but it is the Pope who appoints. If the bishops reject one or more of the clergy's candidates, they must explain to Rome the motives of such rejection.

What meets us next (Tit. ii., capp. 2, 3, 4) are the office and duties of Consultors, Examiners, and Rural Deans. Of the consultors, one-half are to be named by the bishop, the other half to be proposed by the priests who are in the exercise of the ministry, and for each consultor the priest must offer three names. The consent of the consultors is never needed for any measure proceeding from episcopal authority, but their opinion must be asked in the following cases: (1) When a diocesan synod is to be convoked. (2) For the dismembering or reducing the limits of a quasi-parish. (3) For handing over to Regulars a mission or quasi-parish. (4) In the choice of a new consultor and of the examiners. (5) Where diocesan property is to be sold, bought, etc., or handled in any business way that has the form of alienation, provided the sum does not exceed five thousand dollars. If it goes beyond that amount, the opinion of the consultors must be asked for, and the additional leave of the Holy See. Consultors are chosen for three years, but if their term of office expire during vacancy of the See, they hold over till the installation of the new bishop. They are to be summoned to meet

four times, or at least twice, a year. The very name of the Examiners of the clergy explains their office. They are to preside over the *concursum* of the clergy who seek promotion to an irremovable rectorship. They must swear to do their duty faithfully and keep their hands clean from aught that might be even the shadow of a bribe. The Rural Deans, otherwise known as *Vicarii Foranei* (outside vicars), may be appointed or not by the bishop according to his judgment, for they can only be needed in a diocese where the number of the country clergy is very large. In poor dioceses, and where priests are very few, as in the South and the far West, they are not needed. Their duty is to preside at theological conferences held in the country, to watch over Church discipline in their section, and to report to the bishop whatever may need correction or any other intervention of authority.

The next chapter (V.) treats of Irremovable Rectors. Certain missions or churches are to be selected by the bishop with the advice of his consultors, to which irremovable rectors are to be assigned, who are permanently instituted as they are in England. Their station in such a church is not a *benefice*, properly so-called, but may be regarded in some way as *ad instar beneficii*, inasmuch as the incumbent cannot be deprived except in legal form and after due process, which is fully explained in other decrees of the Council (Nos. 38, 308-316; and in the Appendix, pp. 287-292, 293-297). The proportion of irremovable to removable rectors shall be as one to ten. Those who apply for the position of irremovable rector must be examined, in presence of the bishop or his vicar, by at least three examiners, both in writing and *viva voce*, in Moral and Dogmatic Theology, Liturgy, and Canon Law. Besides, he must handle catechetically one or two questions from the Catechism to give proof of his ability to instruct his flock in Christian Doctrine, and to the same end write a sermon upon some Gospel text chosen by the examiners. All precautions must be taken to make the examination thorough and conscientious. The moral standing of the candidates must also be diligently investigated. The examiners are bound to submit not only the name of the one whom they judge the most worthy, but the names of all candidates whom they have found really and truly worthy of the office, for the selection lies not with them, but with the bishop. If there be only one vacancy, those who have been judged competent, and have not been promoted, will be considered worthy of promotion, should a vacancy occur during the next six years. After that period, if they still aspire to promotion, they must undergo a new examination.

Some of what was enacted in the 7th chapter of the same Title (regarding priests ordained for a diocese, or lawfully adopted into

it) has been rendered superfluous by a privilege lately obtained from Rome (November 22d, 1885), in virtue of which henceforth a priest ordained for any diocese may go to serve the missions of another diocese within the same province, with the consent of both Ordinaries, without the necessity of taking a new oath. This provision is also, to some extent, retroactive. Those already ordained for one diocese may transfer their services to another diocese, provided it be in the same province and with the good will of both Ordinaries. In this latter case, the consent of the Holy See, which has heretofore been an essential requisite, is no longer needed; but the transferred priest must take a new oath. Neither in the case of priests ordained since the Rescript of 1885 is there any further need of recourse to the Holy See, since it is understood that the meaning of the oath is no longer limited to one diocese, but extends to the whole province. The concluding paragraphs of the same chapter treat of priests who have been disabled for the further exercise of the ministry by sickness or old age, or who, by their own fault, have rendered themselves morally incapable of exercising any longer their sacred functions. For the support of the former the bishop, taking counsel of his clergy, must provide either by taxing the parishes or the salaries of the clergy, or by mutual aid societies, to membership in which societies priests may be invited and urged, but not compelled, as in the decree there is no mention of compulsion. For the latter, the charitable provision is made that they be sent to a religious house or monastery, to give them an opportunity of effacing the past and regaining their spiritual life and vigor.

The chapter on the "Virtuous Life of the Clergy" does little more than repeat the decrees of 1867. The wearing of the Roman collar is enjoined. There is added a prohibition to attend horse-races or the theatre. A priest must not carry into court a case, though only temporal matters are in question and the defendant is a layman, unless it is impossible to settle the case otherwise. They must not sue for pew-rents or other moneys owing to a church, unless with the previous permission of the bishop in writing. The same written permission must be obtained whenever they summon before the civil court a brother-priest or cleric about temporal matters. And it shall be the duty of the bishop to spare no effort to settle the matter by compromise, by laying it before his consultants or before the vestrymen of the church, if the case admit of it. The old law of ecclesiastical immunities still lives in the hearts of the Christian people, and even though we know it never can be revived, we are bound to respect its spirit. Over matters of Church discipline, and where Church authority is concerned, a priest who attempts to hinder directly or indirectly the exercise of such

authority by recourse to secular tribunals, incurs a special excommunication reserved to the Roman Pontiff. This is set down as a warning not for priests only, but for laymen also. For not only is the priest excommunicated, but likewise all who in any way aid or abet him in his wicked course (*ejus mandata procurantes, edentes, aut auxilium, consilium vel favorem præstantes*).

The Regulars, or Religious Orders, are next considered, and their exemptions duly set forth. Precautions are taken lest Sisters should go about begging at all times and in all places, to the scandal of the faithful, and to their own possible spiritual detriment. In some parts of the country this had become such an intolerable abuse, that it needed to be checked with an iron hand. In the same spirit, No. 295 of Title IX. enacts penalties against clerical beggars from foreign parts, both secular and religious, who come with worthless credentials or with no papers at all, not a few of them *vagabonds* in every sense of the word, very many of them a source of scandal to clergy and people by their persistent begging, in the teeth of episcopal prohibition. European bishops, who, after due warning, refuse to recall these troublers of another's household, are to be denounced to the Holy See.

In the Title of "Divine Worship," we have, first, the determining of those holydays that are to be kept as of obligation everywhere. Out of nine, we lose three; in New Orleans and its dependencies, two have been superadded to their former four; in California, Oregon and New Mexico, from fourteen, they have been reduced to six. It was necessary to make some sacrifice to obtain the advantage of uniformity, and, though some may regret the loss of the 25th of March, Annunciation Day, they can redouble their fervor by prefixing a Novena or Triduum, and holding high festival in their hearts at Mass and Communion of the day; and, what will be most pleasing to God, humbly acquiescing in the thought that their ecclesiastical superiors have not uprooted old traditional practices with reckless hand for the sake of novelty, but have acted wisely and well for God's glory and the good of souls. As to fasting, the difference of climate, the lack, in many places, of food suitable to one who keeps the abstinence, the physical needs of the laboring classes, and other considerations make it nearly impossible to attain anything like uniformity in this vast country of ours. Whatever uniformity is attainable, must be local to a great extent, limited to a few conterminous States, and agreed on in Provincial Councils.

The Christian observance of the Sunday is recommended and warmly urged by the Council. The hearing of Mass, abstinence from all servile works, and exercises of piety and devotion must sanctify the day. There is no harm in innocent recreation, for this

is allowed by the Church, to whom Christianity owes the institution of the Lord's Day, or rather its being chosen to take the place of the abolished Jewish Sabbath. But this recreation must be, in every respect, *innocent*. It must not include amusements nor places of resort in which there is danger of sin. Many who kept themselves undefiled by sin during a week of hard work, fall under the power of the devil by frequenting bar-rooms and saloons on Sunday. The warning of the Council applies principally to two classes,—those who have emigrated hither from Continental Europe, Catholic and Protestant. In the former, infidels rule, who hate God and His Church, and whatever Catholics esteem sacred; in the latter other infidels, who allow themselves to be called Protestant, but look on Sunday as a day of rest from material work. Catholics who come from either place, have been taught by government influence to hate the Lord's Day, or to make light of it. We must do our best to teach them differently. The other class is that of some of our young men, born in the Church, but brought up in the godless schools, where children too often learn to despise the authority of the Catholic Church.

In the Chapter on Marriage, the faithful are reminded that, since no authority on earth can dissolve the marriage bond, it is sinful to appeal to any civil court for divorce, and sinful in a far higher degree to attempt marriage on the plea of having obtained such falsely-named divorce. They incur, *ipso facto*, excommunication, reserved to the Ordinary. Neither may they, without first consulting the ecclesiastical authorities, apply to a civil court for partial separation, viz.: *à mensa et thoro*. Catholics who, in any State or Territory, outside of their own diocese, shall presume to call on the minister of any sect to perform the religious ceremony of marriage, are excommunicated, and cannot be relieved of this censure except by some bishop, or priest by him specially delegated. If he commit the offence in his own diocese, he must be absolved by his own Ordinary, or by another bishop, provided the application be not made *in fraudem legis* (i.e., with intent to elude the law). In those parts of the country (with the exception of the Province of Santa Fé) where the decree *Tametsi*, or the legislation of Trent, making the presence of the parish priest necessary for the validity of marriage, is in vigor, and it is uncertain whether they enjoy the benefit of the Benedictine Declaration or not, such, for example, as Galveston, San Antonio, Brownsville, and their dependencies, the Holy See extends to them likewise by positive enactment, the aforesaid declaration (p. cviii).

Titles V. and VI. treat of the clerical training in seminaries and the instruction of youth in colleges, academies, parochial and mixed schools. Seminaries are, wherever it is possible, to be of two

kinds,—the small or preparatory seminary, and the greater, or seminary properly so-called. In both, the full course is of six years (Nos. 145, 166), so that the full curriculum of studies for the priesthood will be twelve years. Of these, the last four years are devoted to theology, the seventh and eighth to philosophy. In the lesser seminary, the study of American history and the perfect mastery of the English tongue are warmly inculcated. A knowledge of Latin is also made obligatory, not such as is generally picked up in schools and reckoned sufficient by most professional men of the world, but such as will enable them to think and converse in Latin. This, far from being impossible, is not as difficult as many imagine. Students must, also, familiarize themselves with some modern language, such as French, German, Spanish, Italian, Polish, etc., which may be of service on the missions of the diocese to which they belong. In seminaries that have no villa or country-place of their own for summer vacation, the students, should they return to their homes, should be under the immediate supervision of their parish-priest, whose duty it is made to watch over them carefully and continually. All newly-ordained priests, that they may preserve the habit of study acquired in the seminary, must be examined, at least once a year for five years, by the bishop, or his representative, and the examiners of the clergy in various branches of study, viz.: Canon Law, Scripture, Theology, Ecclesiastical History, etc. This is an excellent law, and, if faithfully carried out, will be of immense advantage.

Parochial schools must be founded in every parish, where it is possible to do so. No one must attend those public schools in which the faith of children is endangered or compromised by sectarian teaching or practices. The ordinary common schools may be frequented, whenever there is good reason to do so, of which reason the bishop is the proper judge. When this is allowed by competent authority, let no one, layman or ecclesiastic of high or low degree, presume to condemn or denounce such action, much less to make it a pretext for repelling the children or their parents from the sacraments. Such presumption is no sign of orthodoxy, or strict morality; it is a direct insult to Church authority, and, above all, to the Holy See, which has spoken its mind plainly enough. (See § 198, p. 104.) Parochial schools must be under the supervision of a school board or diocesan committee of examiners, consisting of priests appointed by the bishop *ad beneplacitum*, who shall have power to examine all those, male and female, lay persons or members of diocesan religious congregations, who apply for the position of teachers in these schools. Those who are found worthy shall receive a diploma from the board, which will hold for any diocese in the country. No one, lacking this diploma,

can be employed in future by any priest who has charge of a school. At the end of five years, they must undergo another examination, which will be final. Those who fail in the examination once or twice, must be put off for the examination that will take place in the following year. We firmly believe that this is one of the most important steps yet taken to secure the efficiency of the parochial schools.

Title VII. "On Christian Doctrine" instructs clergy and laity on several points, preaching, prayer-books, catechisms, books, newspapers, etc. The most important of these regulations are: there must be a sermon on Sundays and festivals, if possible, at every mass, even low masses, though it do not exceed five minutes, duration; one Catechism must be provided for the whole country, translated (when necessary) into various languages. No one is allowed to read bad books against religion or good morals, on the poor plea that the laws of Roman congregations have not been promulgated in this country. Though the letter of these laws were unknown here, yet we are bound by their spirit. The publication of Catholic newspapers is also recommended, and in each province it is advised that one paper should be under the fostering care of the Bishop, and be entitled to receive the encouragement and support of both clergy and laity.

Title VIII. "On Zeal for Salvation of Souls" earnestly commends to all the care of immigrants when they first land upon our shores, and pastoral solicitude for the souls of the Indians and of the colored race. Stated times are assigned in which collections are to be taken up for their benefit. As regards the colored people at the South, their Catholic fellow-citizens, clergy and laity, do their duty fully and faithfully, throwing behind them all memory of the rancorous, revengeful spirit that brought about the present legislation, designed rather to injure the white than to benefit the colored population. As to the Indians, the Archbishop of Baltimore and four bishops, selected by those prelates who have Indians under their jurisdiction, will take charge of their spiritual interests, in so far as they may be influenced by Government action in the appointment of Indian agents and religious teachers by "our paternal government." They will continue to use their best efforts to undo the last traces of the anti-Catholic policy of Hiram Ulysses Grant and his spiritual adviser, Rev. Mr. Newman, who without scruple sent out Methodist agents and missionaries to rob Catholic Indians of their supplies and their religion. So deeply was the principle of this evil practice rooted in the minds of Washington statesmen, that very soon after a Cabinet minister told one of our bishops that the Washington Government was not bound to respect the religious predilections of Indians, and that they must take from the Government their religious notions as well as their blankets

and other supplies. The name of this base functionary is well known, and will be duly handed down to later generations.

This same Title in its third chapter discusses societies of various kinds, lawful, unlawful and Temperance societies. Lawful societies are to be encouraged and membership recommended. Societies that are evidently bad, as Free-Masons, Odd-Fellows, Socialistic and Revolutionist Clubs, are under the ban of the Church; and he who joins, imperils his soul, or, not in a few cases, actually hands it over to the keeping of the Prince of Darkness. Societies of doubtful character must not be condemned by name by any individual in authority, but inquired into and examined by a committee, consisting of all the archbishops of the country. Temperance societies are a great blessing, when they are truly Catholic, having for their ground-work the form and substance of pious sodalities or confraternities, in which good resolutions are prompted by Catholic faith, helped by assiduous prayer, and maintained by the fervent use of the sacraments. Otherwise they fall into the power of artful demagogues, headstrong men, rebellious to the Church, not caring for the observance of the Decalogue, nor afraid of the other six deadly sins, but priding themselves on their outward works, and especially their abstinence from drink, which can no more save their souls than could pompous fasting save the Pharisees who hated Christ our Lord and Saviour.

The next Title treats of the temporalities of the Church and how they are to be managed by bishops, priests and lay-trustees or vestrymen in their respective spheres. None of them can alienate church property which they administer; the bishop only to a limited extent and with permission of the Holy See. Lay-trustees must be proposed by the pastor, when elected by the congregation, and must be approved by the bishop in writing. They are to be presided over by the pastor, whose consent is necessary to make valid their deliberations.

An important chapter is the Fifth, which handles a very timely subject, "the raising of church money by improper means." The collecting of money at church doors for entering to hear mass is condemned as a shameful abuse, which ought to have been done away with years ago, when Pius IX. condemned it and ordered its discontinuance. The Fathers of the Council were so reluctant to admit the existence of such shameful disobedience to the earnestly expressed will of the great Pontiff, that they only spoke of the practice as a possible contingency, "*Praxis, sicubi forte existat*," "The practice, if *perchance* it yet survive anywhere," etc. We were delighted to learn, and we hope the news may be true, that the last vestige of this detestable usage has disappeared, and

that entrance to the Church and her Sacred Mysteries is now perfectly free, without let or hindrance, in all our large cities.

Further, a free space is to be left in the Church for those who are too poor to contribute. But it must be so arranged that the stigma of "pauperism" (an anti-Catholic term of reproach, wholly unknown to the true Church of Christ) shall not attach to any one enjoying the benefit of this free area for worship. There are no "paupers" in the Catholic Church. This ugly word came into our language with the "Reformation," which destroyed Christian charity and mercy to the poor, as all the "Reformers" confessed, Lutherans and Anglicans alike, with wonderful unanimity. But true Christianity forbids us to do aught that has even the semblance of dishonoring the poor (James ii., 6) or making them blush for the condition in which our Heavenly Father has placed them. St. John Baptist de Rossi, lately canonized, had the true spirit of the Founder of Christianity, for he could not bear to speak of the poor himself, nor allow others to do it in his presence, without softening their name with the tender Italian diminutive of "I poverelli di Cristo," "the poor little ones of Christ."

Picnics, excursions, and like amusements for raising church or benevolent funds are too often occasions of sin and danger, especially in our large Northern cities. In the South, and in some country places of the West, where the congregation goes out in a body, under the guidance of the pastor, and without any disturbing element from outside, they are genuine sources of happy, innocent recreation, and the money derived from such parties or excursions has upon it no taint of sin. But in large cities, or their neighborhood, too much caution cannot be observed in removing all occasions of sin. Hence they can only be held by special leave of the bishop, never at night, nor on Sundays or festivals, and forbidding the use of wine, beer or intoxicating liquors. Fairs, too, are subject to the same restrictions. Balls, with dancing and banquets, for pious purposes, in which the Devil puts on the garb of religion or, as the poet says, dresses himself up "in his Sunday's best," we never heard of before, but they must exist in some of our large Northern cities, for the Council has heard of them and stamped them with its seal of reprobation.

There are two other abuses, which were condemned by the Council of 1866, but which nevertheless continue to be as faithfully kept up as if they were binding laws of Holy Church which it were a sin to neglect. The first is, that priests come down from the altar to beg during the celebration of Mass. This is "a most shameful abuse," to use the language of both Councils, "that makes Catholics blush and awakens a feeling of mockery and contempt amongst outsiders." The other is the advertising in circulars,

by religious bodies, of Masses to be said for contributors to certain alleged pious purposes. Bishops are bound in conscience to see that such scandals are removed from before the eyes of the faithful.

The next Title (on Ecclesiastical Trials) has no general interest, since it only lays down the order and mode of procedure in the case of clerics summoned before the bishop's court, or Ecclesiastical Tribunal. Whenever a bishop's court cannot be immediately organized, Rome will dispense as long as the difficulty lasts. Meanwhile the bishop must follow the tenor of the instruction of July 20th, 1878, with its subsequent explanation, without losing sight of the spirit of the latest instruction, which is printed on p. 287. The Holy See not only desires that justice be done; but in cases of appeal wishes further to know on *what* grounds, on what *acta et probata*, a decision has been rendered, and such knowledge would be sufficient to knock on the head most of those appeals that for several years back have been floating backward and forward, shadow-like, without shape, color or substance, between Rome and this country, puzzling alternately both sides and even finding their way to our secular tribunals.

In the Title XI. on "Ecclesiastical Burial" the law of 1866 has been mitigated to this extent, that Catholics who not only possessed lots in non-Catholic cemeteries before 1853, but also those who have acquired one *bona fide* after that year, may be buried in it, and have their burial service performed with Catholic rites, either at home or in the church, unless the bishop forbid it for special reasons.

The provisions of the Third Plenary Council, though we have not been able to dwell on them as fully as we should wish, are replete with wisdom and prudent foresight; and if carried out in the same wise and zealous spirit in which they were conceived, will be of immense benefit to the Catholic Church of this country. They have been deservedly praised and commended by the American secular press, and even by a few of the so-called religious papers. But these few are the exception. The rest with one voice condemn or cavil at every thing, even the most undeniably charitable and wholesome provisions. The chapters on fallen priests, on temperance, on divorce, furnish matter for sneering and calumny, instead of commendation. These are the men who kindly pat on the back French atheists, and see little or no harm in their attempts to root the idea of God out of the mind and heart of France, as long as they persecute the Church and her ministers. Some Protestant ministers have had the good sense and courage to protest against this disgraceful mode of warfare, but their protests have been unheeded. Prophecy must be fulfilled; and the daily life of the Church has been foreshadowed centuries ago in that of

her Divine Founder. Our Saviour was compelled day after day to expostulate with His enemies, to appeal to their honesty and reason, to ask them calmly if they had any good argument wherewith to convict Him of sinful life or false teaching. "*Quis ex vobis arguet me de peccato?*"¹ And how did they answer this dispassionate appeal? With reviling and blasphemy. *Samaritanus es tu et dæmonium habes.* "Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil." Our religious editors would do well to consider what an unholy pattern they have set up (unconsciously, we trust) for imitation.

THE CHURCH AND CREMATION.

Cremation and Other Modes of Sepulture. By R. E. Williams, A.M.
"Omnes homines terra et cinis," Ecclesiasticus, xvii., 31. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1884. 12mo.

WE were just on the point of making the above mentioned book, sent us by a friend for perusal, a peg on which to hang some observations on the attitude of the Church to the modern theory of cremation, when we received the following letter from one of our readers in Buffalo, N. Y., which will answer our purpose as well. Whether the writer be Catholic or Protestant, does not appear from the letter itself. But it makes no difference; and in either case we accord him the same impartial hearing.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

DEAR SIR:

I take it that your REVIEW sets forth the tendency of the best thought of the Catholic Church in this country. Even by its enemies it must be conceded that the belief of the Catholic Church is eminently logical and consistent and that its deductions are, for the most part, drawn with common sense. As a believer in the expediency of cremation, I am sorry to see any tendency on the part of the Church to commit itself to opposing this sensible reform.

With the first part of Dr. Brann's article on cremation in your October issue, I have nothing to do. It simply sets forth the belief, not only of Catholics but of all Christian people, that the human body, even in death, is a sacred thing and should be the object of tender and solemn respect. That in the process of cremation the body itself

¹ John viii., 46.

is subjected to any indignity, is no more true than that it is degraded by the process of inhumation.

The objection that cremation would interfere with the resurrection of the body has been so often and so thoroughly refuted; that it scarcely needs the repetition of the old and often stated argument which almost casts ridicule on the man who takes this position. The simple question, "Is it any more of a miracle for the Divine Power to resurrect the body from the ashes which are the result of cremation, than to resurrect the body from the dust which is the result of inhumation?" seems to me most thoroughly to dispose of this question. It would seem that the anxiety with early Christians to be inhumated, to which Dr. Brann refers, showed less faith in the power of God than does the belief of the modern Christian, that so far as the day of judgment is concerned, it matters little what is the present disposition of his material body.

When the learned Doctor argues against the sanitary conditions of cremation, he shows that he has not thoroughly investigated his subject. He prefaces his plea for inhumation by the condition, "if proper precautions are taken." The unfortunate fact is, that proper precautions are hardly ever taken. In most large cities in America very little fault is to be found with the location of cemeteries in their effect on water supply and other channels of infection, but in small towns little if any care is shown in this particular, and even where the utmost care is taken as to location, both in cities and towns, the other conditions which make inhumation harmless, are seldom given the scrutiny their importance deserves.

But I had not meant to combat or attempt to combat the Doctor's reasoning. Long ago abler pens than mine have furnished thorough refutation for every argument he advances. I had only meant to ask that those who represent the most advanced thought in the Catholic Church should hold their hands until the public at large has gained a little more thorough understanding of the subject, and until its more general adoption shall render patent to the many what is well known to the few, that there is nothing objectionable to the most religious mind in the modern practice of cremation. Ere long the Catholic Church will speak officially on the subject, and its utterance will be the result of that mature thought which characterizes all its decrees. That the actual practice of cremation, modified to suit the liturgy and ritual of the Catholic Church, with crematories consecrated to its service, with the final deposit of ashes taking the place of the final deposit of the body, whether in tomb or in grave, I have no doubt the decision of the Church will be that a good Catholic may let his views as a good citizen, wishing the good of his fellow-men, permit him to direct that his mortal remains shall be disposed of by the cleanly and innocuous process of cremation, and do this excellent thing with the full sanction of his Church.

I am, with all respect,

Yours,

JAMES S. METCALFE.

With the general tenor of Mr. M.'s letter we can have no fault to find. There is, however, at the close of its third paragraph, a statement which cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed. "The anxiety of the early Christians to be inhumated to which Dr. Brann refers" would seem, in the opinion of Mr. Metcalfe, to argue "less faith in the power of God than does the belief of the modern Christian that, so far as the day of judgment is concerned, it matters little what is the present disposition of his material body."

Now this misconception, on the part of Mr. Metcalfe, would seem due to the fact that the writer of the article in the October number of the *QUARTERLY*, though quoting correctly enough the substance of what is found in Eusebius, has introduced it by words some-

what ambiguous, and which, to some extent, do not allow the reader to see the exact value of the quotation from the Greek historian. "Eusebius (Hist. Eccles., v. 1)," says the writer, "gives a reason for the Christian aversion to cremation which still holds good, because 'they (the Pagans) did this (cremate) to show that they could conquer God and destroy the resurrection of the bodies, saying, now let us see if they will arise.'"

This passage offers ground for a few remarks. In the first place, Eusebius does not pretend to give any reason why Christians are on principle opposed to cremation. Secondly, it is not Eusebius who speaks at all. The language occurs in an old and valuable document which Eusebius, like a faithful historian, has transcribed *ad literam*. He considered it so precious because of its antiquity and because written by eye witnesses, and so edifying in its style that he preferred to give it whole and entire to posterity rather than condense the narrative in words of his own. It is the letter of the Church of Lyons and Vienne to their brethren in Asia and Phrygia, one of the most precious and touching monuments, as a Protestant historian¹ remarks, that has come down to us from Christian antiquity.² The authors of the letter, who write with the sanction and in the name of the Church, were those who waited upon the holy martyrs Vettius, Blandina, Pothinus (bishop of Lyons), Attalus, and a host of others, and were eye-witnesses of the torments they endured from the hour of their arrest to that of their martyrdom.

Now, what say these writers? They do not put forth opinions nor give reasons of any kind about the practice of inhumation or cremation or other form of burial; they merely deal with the facts of which they had been witnesses. Naturally they mourn over their unavailing efforts to rescue or ransom for burial the limbs of some of the martyrs, thrown to be devoured by the dogs of the street. But with such jealous, malignant care were these remains watched by the Pagan soldiery, that the shades of night could not aid their pious purpose; nor could fervent entreaties, nor the proffer of gold move to pity those wicked men, as if they counted it great gain to prevent the burial of those holy relics.

"Nos gravissimo interim dolore premebatur quod humare cada-

¹ Joseph Scaliger.

² It may be found in the edition of Eusebius by Valesius, Paris, 1687, and in the 1st chapter of Book V., where a Latin translation accompanies the Greek original. This is not the best edition of Eusebius, but it is the only one to which the writer has access. The same document is given, but only in a Latin version, by Ruinart in his *Acta Martyrum*, Verona, 1731. The ordinary reader will find its substance in Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, in his account of St. Pothinus (June 2). St. Irenæus was his successor in the See of Lyons.

vera¹ nobis non liceret nam neque noctis tenebræ nos juvare, neque auri vis flectere neque preces ullæ animos eorum commovere potuerunt; sed omni studio atque industria cadavera custodiebant, quasi ingens lucrum facturi, si sepultura caruissent."²

But why did these clients of the holy martyrs so ardently wish to recover their sacred remains? It was not only to rescue them from profanation and give them due honor of Christian sepulture, but to rejoice with holy joy in the possession and safe-keeping of those venerable relics, which they counted "a priceless treasure," "surpassing in worth all fine gold and costly gems."³ They were, besides, moved to just indignation when they saw the ashes of the martyrs, which they longed to possess, cast into the rapid waters of the Rhone, that all hope of their recovery might be lost. And, what heightened their indignation, was the blasphemous reason alleged by the persecutors for so doing. "They acted thus," says the Lyonnese letter, "as if they were superior (in power) to God, and could deprive them (the martyrs) of their resurrection, saying forsooth: All hope of their rising again has vanished; let us see if their God by His help can bring them again to life and deliver them out of our hands." Here is Ruinart's version of the original Greek, which we have not literally translated, but faithfully condensed:

"Igitur martyrum corpora postquam omni genere contumeliæ traducta et sub dño per sex dies exposita jacuerunt, tandem cremata atque in cineres redacta in præterfluentis Rhodani alveum sparsa sunt ab impiis, ne ullæ deinceps eorum reliquiæ in terris superessent. Atque id agebant prorsus, quasi Deo superiores esse et resurrectionem illis adimere possent; ut, quemadmodum ipsi dicebant, ne spes quidem ulla resurgendi eis relinqueretur. . . . Videamus nunc an sint resurrecturi, et utrum adesse ipsis Deus suus ac de manibus nostris ipsos eripere valeat."⁴

One, therefore, may be reasonably astonished how any one could see in this document of Eusebius any "reason" or principle on which the early Christians refused to adopt or follow the practice of cremation. All that can be legitimately deduced from the above, or similar individual cases, is that the primitive Christians objected to the burning of their martyrs by the Pagan enemy, who thus robbed them of "inestimable treasures," and to this robbery added

¹ This is a generic term, comprising the "membra partim laniata, partim ambusta," and the "capita cum ipsis corporum truncis" of which the writer speaks a few lines before.

² Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum*, ed. cit., p. 59.

³ "Θεσσαρός ἀτιμητος." "Τα τιμιώτερα λίθων πολυτελών και δοκιμώτερα υπέρ χρυσίου." Ruinart, op. cit., in Act. Pass. St. Ignatii, p. 19; S. Polycarpi, p. 37.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 59, § 16.

the impious, blasphemous intent of thereby making it impossible for the Almighty Power to raise them with whole bodies on the last day. And we may confidently ask Mr. Metcalfe where, in all these accounts, can he detect a shadow of proof, or even of suspicion, that the faith of the early Christians in God's power was less strong than that of the Christians of our own day. Or in what century did the horror aroused in a Christian breast by hearing the blasphemous denial of God's attributes first begin to be held by the tribunal of history as constructive acquiescence in the truth of the blasphemy?

We have in the Acts of the martyrs very many instances where these champions of the Faith, when threatened with death by fire, which would destroy all hope of their resurrection in the body, would only smile at the impotent threat and say nothing, while waiting with calm joy their final sentence. Others would indignantly rebuke the blaspheming judge, and warn him that the God whom the Christians worshipped was Almighty, and that no power in the world, either visible or invisible, could thwart His will or make void His promises. Of one¹ it is recorded that, when condemned to the flames, after a short prayer, with the air of an inspired prophet of Israel, and in words as far above the ordinary fashion of human speech as the heavens are above the earth, declared himself willing and anxious to be cast into the devouring flames as a proof of the final resurrection.²

Coming now to note specially another point of Mr. M.'s letter, it is evident that he honestly believes cremation to be necessary for public health. Should this be demonstrated in such way that public opinion will have to yield to the evidence, there is little doubt that the Church will find no difficulty in accommodating

¹ St. Pionius, priest of Smyrna. *Vid. Ruinart, Acta SS. Pionii et Socior., op. cit., p. 120.*

² *Haec me ducit causa, haec me potissimum ratio compellit ad mortem, ut populus omnis intelligat resurrectionem futuram esse post mortem. Ibid., p. 127.*

See also Evodius, Assemani, "*Acta Martyrum Orientalium et Occidentalium.*" Rome, 1748, 2 vols. in one, fo. The confidence of the martyrs in the resurrection of their bodies, even when consumed by fire, is expressed so often that it would be hard to select from such a mass of testimony. It is enough to refer the reader to the word *Resurrectio* in the indices of both volumes.

Speaking of the Acts of St. Pionius, there is extant in them a testimony to the substantiality of the Father and the Son, which, we regret to see, is seldom, if ever, quoted in theological courses. St. Pionius and St. Theodota had already confessed their belief in the "Supreme God, creator of heaven and earth." St. Asclepiades, being called on immediately after, and asked in whom he believed, replied, "In Christ." "What! (asked Polemon, the judge) Is that another God?" "No (said Asclepiades); He is the same whom they have just now confessed." This unstudied utterance shows the habitual thought of the Christian people in the century that preceded the Council of Nice, and in one sense is more valuable than a passage from a professed controversial writer.

herself to the practice. She has adhered to inhumation because when she appeared on earth she found it the received usage of God's chosen people, to whose inheritance she had succeeded, and her Divine Founder had condescended to be entombed in the earth. Had she found, when she came into the world, the practice of cremation prevalent everywhere, she would have made it her own. She did not find any Divine command to the contrary ; for the passages that are often cited as such (Gen. xv., 15, and Deut. xxi., 23) do not exactly command burial in the earth, but rather presuppose it as an existing usage. She would have adopted it, as she did so many other practices of the Pagan world, purifying it first from every vestige of Pagan contamination. She would have framed her Ritual accordingly, and drawn many a fitting reflection from the upward tendency of the flame, the dross-consuming, purifying influence of fire, etc.

But is this necessity of cremation demonstrated *ad evidentiam* ? Mr. Metcalfe thinks so ; but there are not a few physicians and scientists, both inside and outside of the Church, who think very differently. Some even in our country go to the length of asserting that it might prove dangerous and become a source of infection. We do not pretend to decide the question ; but it looks hard to suggest any action by the Church, positive or negative, until the question is decided. It was the mistake of Galileo, who insisted that the Church should explain the Scriptures in accordance with his new theory. But Cardinal Bellarmine very properly told him that this could not be done as long as it was a mere theory. It would be time enough when the theory had reached the point of demonstration.

Another reflection, and we have done. The Church has little faith in the good intentions of the men who are urging the theory and practice of cremation. In the mind of Mr. M. and a few like him there reigns no un-Christian sentiment, but a *bona fide* scientific opinion, whether well-founded or not matters little. But these are only the few. The great army of cremationists in Europe is made up of Atheists and infidels, professed enemies of God and His revelation. It is clear enough that, though some of them advance scientific pretexts for their purpose, most of them argue on irreligious grounds, and re-echo the spirit, if not the words, of the Pagan crowds who burnt the martyrs. Could the Church be supposed to listen with any confidence or respect to such men and their theories ? And of some men of doubtful faith amongst ourselves it may well be asked : If they are so intent upon benefiting the public and averting infection, why is it that they have ever on their lips cremation, and cremation only ? Why is it that they do not champion the cause of pure water and good drainage. The

water men drink in our big cities is an abomination. Drainage was perfectly understood two thousand years ago and more;¹ it is now one of the lost arts. Bad water and bad drainage are daily slaying thousands. Where is the loud cry of our benevolent philosophers?

We entertain well-grounded fears that the day will come when cremation will be forced upon unwilling peoples by law. It will begin in Europe, where the worst elements of society are fast growing into power. It will not be done with the benevolent view of providing for public health, though this pretence may be put forward. Or perhaps they may be cynical enough to incorporate in the law their true motives, just as the French Republic attempted a hundred years ago to abolish by law the immortality of the soul. As to our own country, it will be done much later, if ever; though we are filled with misgivings, when we remember what has happened within the last forty years. One thing is certain. Should cremation ever be made compulsory by the civil power, the Church will yield obedience to the law, and adapt her prayers and funeral rites to the new method of incineration. So we are distinctly told on high authority, that of Professor Sanguinetti, in his "Institutes of Canon Law" (*Cap. De Sepulturis*) printed at Rome (with ecclesiastical *imprimatur*) no later than two years ago, in 1884.

¹ Cf. Card. Wiseman's Essay entitled, *Sense vs. Science*.

Scientific Chronicle.

SCIENTISTS AMONG THE CLERGY.

IN our last issue we referred to the words of Cardinal Pitra in which he urges that the Catholic priesthood should number in its ranks specialists in the various branches of science. In this connection, a word might be said of the relation borne to science by the clergy of the present time. The custom of maligning the Catholic Church as the opponent of scientific progress has not altogether passed out of fashion among the enemies of Catholicity. Now it would be an interesting study to take up the history of the march of science and see how many Catholics, and especially how many Catholic priests, have been in the van.

We must not forget, moreover, that it is in spite of a world of unavoidable impediments that a Catholic priest must labor in this line of work. Scientific study requires leisure. Yet of necessity how little leisure does a priest enjoy! Many are the duties of his sacred ministry that tax his days and often call for much of the night. When to this is added—as is sometimes the case—the task of teaching, which usually exacts considerable preparation, it will be seen that the time remaining for deeper study or original research is at best but a trifle. Besides, it is not usual for a priest to have at his command the costly instruments necessary for even the simplest work in some of the natural sciences, and often, too, he is without means to meet the expenses essential to experiments of an original kind. Notwithstanding, there has been a great deal of valuable work done by such men. Yet the world receives very little information thereof. To an observant reader of scientific journals it is evident that there is not a little exclusiveness among some of the magnates in scientific circles. They may be unconscious of it. But it is there: and one daily sees meagre results from the labor of one of their own set explained to the full and praised as of the highest character, while noble work from other hands is ignored.

True, there is not so much forwardness among religious workers. But neither is there—generally speaking—among truly great scientists; nor should the editor of a scientific journal suffer the clamors of those who lay claim to a prominence to which they have no title, deafen his ears to the modest voice of one whose work speaks for itself. Yet on glancing carelessly here and there at a few numbers of the scientific periodicals, “*Science*,” “*Nature*” and “*The American Journal of Science*” of the past two or three years, we met with a few eminent names, which, fancying they will prove of interest, we shall here briefly review. Be it understood, however, that it is a random choice and prominent men may be passed unnoticed; but we do not by mentioning some to the ex-

clusion of others wish to establish a comparison. Our only object is to name—and that solely from the sources aforesaid—a few of those who are a credit to the Catholic clergy, in the hope that some other may one day undertake a thorough discussion of the topic.

In "Nature" for December 17th, 1885, is published a letter from Father Denza, containing a thoroughly digested report of the shower of meteors on the night of November 27th. The letter is in French and, though rather long, is printed in full, showing that its contents are deemed of value. Father Denza is a Barnabite, Director of the Observatory of Moncalieri at Turin, and President of the Italian Meteorological Association. He was lately sent to France to represent Italy at the Meteorological Congress held at Paris. Some of the results of his observations on the star-shower will be found in this chronicle.

In connection with meteorology another name of note appears. In "Nature" for November 5th, 1885, is given a brief review of a pamphlet on the meteorology of China, published by Father Dechevrens, S. J. Father Dechevrens is at the head of the Zi-ka-wei Observatory near Shanghai, and his work there has frequently received favorable notice in scientific papers. He was at one time sent to Europe at the expense of the Board of Trade of Shanghai to secure suitable instruments for the observatory. He has published a book on the "Typhoons of the Chinese Seas," which has received well-merited attention.

This question of meteorology is absorbing continual interest of late, owing to its value to commerce and the shipping in general. Observers, especially those connected with the U. S. Signal Service, have had so large a percentage of their weather predictions verified that they have been encouraged to push their observations to a further perfection. This will account for the fact that, of late, men whose reputation is founded on work of a much higher order are brought into public notice more frequently on account of meteorological contributions. Thus in "Nature" for July 30th, 1885, the editor acknowledges the receipt from Stonyhurst College Observatory of the "Meteorological Report for 1884," by Rev. S. J. Perry, S. J., F. R. S., and adds that "the work done at this observatory becomes more and more valuable every year." Father Perry was twice sent out by the Royal Observatory at the head of the expedition to observe the transit of Venus. At the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Philadelphia in August, 1884, he read a paper before the Astronomical Section that was received with the highest favor. He has published a number of valuable scientific articles, chiefly on questions connected with astronomy.

Also in "Nature," for March 13th, 1884, Professor Milne of Japan has an interesting paper on earth-tremors, wherein he is not sparing of his praise of Father Bertelli of Florence, whom he acknowledges as "the father of the science of microseismology." For observing passing tremors he recommends the tromometer, an instrument invented by Father Bertelli and Professor Rossi, which he describes at length. Father Bertelli has given himself assiduously to this branch of study for a number of years

past, and "since 1870 has made many thousands of observations" connected therewith.

In the same paper mention is incidentally made by Professor Milne of Father Faura, S.J., who has become noted for his study of typhoons. At the Observatory of Manila, in the Philippine Islands, he has had admirable opportunities for storm-observations, which he has turned to good account. In "Science" for February 7th, 1883, is printed in full the result of a series of his observations made during the typhoon of October 20th, 1882, at Manila, together with the diagrams showing the several maxima and minima of the items in the report.

In the Spring of 1885 Canon Carnoy, of the University of Louvain, published a work on "Cellular Biology," which was taken up by Professor Martin, the Professor of Biology at the Johns-Hopkins University in Baltimore, who published a review of it in "Science" for April 17th, 1885. He was generous in his praise of it, and took occasion therefrom to call attention to this practical refutation of the statement that the Catholic Church and science are at war.

Also in "Science" for September 18th, 1885, is noticed Lieutenant Dyer's translation, "Practical Hints in Relation to West Indian Hurricanes," of which Father Viñes, S.J., Director of the Observatory of the "Colegio de Belen" at Havana, is the author. Some years ago the substance of the same pamphlet was translated in Ferrel's "Meteorological Researches for the Use of the Coast Pilot," in the Coast Survey reports. This, together with the fact that the present version is issued from the Hydrographic Office, goes to show what importance is attached to Father Viñes' conclusions.

In "Science" for February 5th, 1886, is a notice of the death of Father Gaetano Chierici, late Director of the Museum of Antiquities at Reggio. A movement is on foot to place a bust of him in the museum which he so long directed. His specialty was prehistoric archæology, and he has become famous for his study of the Terremares of Æmilia, where his investigations have established the existence of a prehistoric age of bronze.

Going back to the issue of "The American Journal of Science" for April, 1883, we find a notice of the first of a series of "Memoirs on the Natural History of the Chinese Empire." It is on "Trionyx," and written by Father M. Heude, S.J. Father Heude has discovered in China many new species of shells, hitherto unstudied, and has lately been enabled to erect a museum there in which to preserve the collections he has made of these and many other interesting specimens in the several branches of Natural History.

The published results of the work done at the Washburn Observatory, Ann Arbor, Michigan, are reviewed in "Science" for November 20th, 1885. The reviewer has a few words of praise for Father Hagen, S.J., in company with Professor Holden, now of the Lick Observatory in California, which may here be quoted: "The fifth part of the volume is a 'Catalogue of 1001 southern stars for 1850.0, from observations by Signor P. Tacchini at Palermo, in the years 1867, 1868, 1869,' by Rev.

Father Hagen, S. J., and Edward S. Holden. The original observations had never been reduced to mean place; but being good ones, and in a part of the sky where needed, we have here the anomaly of European work reduced and republished in this country; and Father Hagen and Professor Holden are to be highly commended for making it available."

In the same issue of "Science" a merited encomium is passed upon an invention which the Abbé Rougerie of Pamiers, in France, recently brought before the French Academy of Sciences. It is an artificial miniature of the earth, and so arranged that when rapidly rotated it indicates the origin, direction, and interference of the air-currents of our globe. So far it has worked with admirable success, having faithfully reproduced the dominant winds of both hemispheres.

In "Nature" for October 8th, 1885, we found a few words of comment on the Abbé Renard of Belgium. They were in reference to a part of that work which has given him his fame, the arrangement and discussion of the specimens gathered by the "Challenger" in her voyage for deep-sea soundings. His name is well-known in Europe, especially in connection with geological and lithological studies.

Lastly, in the number of "Science" just issued—March 12th, 1886—a brief abstract is given of an essay read before the Geographical Society of Saguenay by the Abbé La Flamme, of the Laval University at Quebec. The paper touches on both the geography and geology of that district, and its contents are of no mean importance.

Before we close we may call attention to the merits of the late Abbé Moigno, editor of "Cosmos" and "Les Mondes," two journals devoted to the interests of science and by no means unknown to scientists abroad. He has published a number of works of merit on scientific subjects.

Nor would this little catalogue be complete without reference to the remarkable work done by the Jesuit Fathers Joubert in mathematics and Secchi in astronomy. Father Ferrari, S. J., who has endeavored to continue Father Secchi's work, has been deprived by the Italian Government of the instruments which the munificence of the Popes and the industry of his predecessor had set up in the Observatory of the Roman College. His place at the Observatory is filled by a secular professor, the appointee of the Government, so that his work is now confined to the meteorological observations which the few instruments at his disposal have placed within his reach. He still publishes the old "Bollettino" of the Roman College, at present, following the fortunes of its editor, reduced to a meteorological record.

In conclusion we have to recall that in a late number of "Nature" high praise was given to the geographical researches of two Catholic missionaries, who, in the scant moments left them from the many and arduous duties of their calling, found leisure to draft an atlas of China, which, it seems, is superior to any that has yet appeared.

The observatories, too, which are at present in the hands of the clergy, notably those of Calcutta, Kalocsa in Hungary, Malta, and Santiago in Chili, as well as those we have incidentally mentioned in the course of

this review, give promise of bringing Catholic priests into prominence as scientific workers.

ASTRONOMY.

THE METEORIC SHOWER OF NOVEMBER 27TH, 1885.

THOSE who follow the scientific movements of the day are aware that on the 27th of last November astronomers all over the world were on the watch for the repetition of the star-shower of the same day in 1872. It had been predicted in Lord Crawford's "*Dun Echt Circular*;" most of the scientific papers had forewarned their readers that it would take place, and on November 23d a paper was read by Mr. Lanker before the Paris Academy of Sciences on "*The Shower of Meteors that may accompany the Transit of the Earth through the Descending Node of Biela's Comet on November 27th.*" Nor had science made a mistake. Early in the evening of November 27th the obedient meteors moved into the atmosphere of the earth, and a brilliant display of celestial fireworks was witnessed throughout Europe and Asia. In this country it had almost ceased before sunset, so that observations could be taken only on the latter and less interesting portions of the shower. The observers of Europe and Asia were more favored. Wherever there was a clear sky clusters of stars could be seen bursting forth in all directions from a point in Andromeda, traversing with slow and steady motion paths seldom exceeding an arc of 20° ; then suddenly disappearing and leaving behind them tracks of light of reddish or bluish-white color. In the beginning of the display many of the meteors were equal to Venus in brightness. Throughout, the field of radiation, according to observations made at Greenwich, Princeton, and elsewhere, was an oval region about 4° long N. and S., and 2° wide, and its centre about 2° N. W. of γ Andromeda. The number of meteors that fell has been variously estimated—the most reliable calculation, made by Fr. Denza, places the number at 150,000. Be this as it may, a comparison of the different accounts in scientific journals will show that the shower of last November was inferior, neither in duration nor in the brightness and the multitude of its meteors, to the remarkable display of 1872. From among these many accounts it may be of interest to quote the following extract from a letter of Fr. Denza to the Paris Academy:

"The spectacle presented to our eyes during the first two hours, when the shower was at its maximum, was wonderful, and almost baffles description. From all parts of the heavens myriads of stars were rained down, as though a nebulous cloud were dissolving. They were followed by luminous tracks, and many surpassed in brilliancy stars of the first magnitude. Their progress was generally slow; their predominant color red, produced, no doubt, by the numerous vapors scattered through the atmosphere. The tracks of those meteors near the radiant point were very short; many, in accordance with the law of perspective, were merely bright points. Most of them fell from the same radiant region

as that of the meteor shower of 1872—between Perseus, Cassiopea, and Andromeda. No secondary centre of radiation was seen, as ordinarily is the case on the nights of greater displays."

All this stellar pyrotechny is of great importance in the eyes of the astronomer, for it brings to his mind fresh proof of the correctness of the theory connecting these displays with comets. These latter wanderers are frequent visitors in that portion of space where the Divine Hand has traced the pathway of our little earth. Even at present there are two, nightly visible in the telescope—Barnard's comet, and one discovered at Paris on December 1st, 1885, by Fabry. According to Dr. Oppenheim (Paris) they will be distinctly visible to the naked eye in northern latitudes about the middle of April or the first of May. Now, some of these comets that cross the earth's orbit are supposed to throw off large masses of matter. This matter may be in the state of gas, or may be a collection of finely divided particles of a solid substance. It is immaterial for our purpose which—it is enough for us that it separates into a number of small bodies revolving in the same orbit as when they were a part of the original mass. The earth as it wheels around its orbit will at some point cross the pathway of the comet. Let us suppose that these stray pieces of the comet are dashing past the crossing point at the same time; they will then come in contact with our atmosphere. Before this contact they are invisible by reason of their smallness, but upon entering our atmosphere they rub against the particles of the air—an enormous heat is generated—the pieces of the comet become brilliantly lighted up—a bright star shoots across the sky. If they are small they vaporize at once, and disappear forever. If they are large enough, or of such a matter as to withstand the heat generated by their motion through the air, they drop to the earth as aerolites. If on any particular occasion they break forth in great numbers from one point of the heavens, we have a star-shower, such as was witnessed on November 27th.

On this theory can be readily explained the brilliant meteoric displays of November 12th–13th. After a long series of investigations by Professor Newton of Yale, and others, it was concluded that they were caused by the earth's encountering a swarm of meteoroids following in the wake of a telescopic comet discovered by Tempel at Marseilles in December, 1865. A similar connection was shown by Schiaparelli to exist between the August meteor-showers and the second comet of 1862.

In the case before us we have a further and very striking proof of this connection. But with what comet are we to connect these meteors of November 27th? The astronomer, searching through the history of heavenly bodies, answers at once—with Biela's comet. What are the reasons that lead him to this conclusion? Let us first say a word or two in regard to the history of this comet. Taking its name from Biela, an Austrian astronomer, who was the first to calculate its orbit, in 1826, it was found to have been observed in 1805, and earlier still in 1772. Its period of revolution was fixed at about six years and six months. However, its next observed visit to the region of the earth was delayed till

the November of 1845. In the following January it was found to have suffered an accident unheard of in the history of its brother comets. It split into two unequal parts, and thus divided sailed off into space. In 1852 it showed itself again, but about September of that year disappeared. Since then eager astronomers have kept up the watch for it during each of its returning periods. It has never reappeared, but on the night of November 27th, 1872, and again during last November, a remarkable stream of meteors was found wandering around the deserted orbit of the comet. Here, then, we build up our reasons for asserting the connection of this star-shower with Biela's comet. First, this stream of meteors exhibits a perfect orbital resemblance to the comet; secondly, the time of the occurrence of this shower is found to be exactly that in which the earth is at the crossing-point of the two orbits, and it is witnessed only in those years when, according to computation, the comet should be somewhere in the vicinity of this crossing-point; and lastly, the radiant point in Andromeda from which the meteors diverge corresponds most accurately to that from which fragments of the comet, moving in the orbit of the original mass, would seem to come. All this can scarcely be the result of mere chance, and weighing well the many facts presented to us, we can reasonably conclude, though not with absolute certainty, that these splendid meteoric displays of November 27th are caused by the burning in the earth's atmosphere of a swarm of meteoroids—remnants of the departed glory of Biela's comet.

CELESTIAL PHOTOGRAPHY.

When, in 1840, Dr. Draper, of New York, succeeded in photographing the Moon, few astronomers even suspected that before the century's close the camera would play such an important rôle in the observatory. In the "Month" for last December Rev. Fr. Perry, S. J., with his wonted thoroughness, gives a view of the camera's applications, past and present, in the celestial science. But so rapid is the progress, and so widespread the good results obtained in this line, that since the publication of Fr. Perry's article some very important achievements have been made public. Among these is the discovery by photography of a new nebula in the Pleiades.

The new nebula, as first photographed on November 16th by MM. Henry at Paris, has a very well marked spiral form, and seems just to escape Maia. Since then it has been photographed several times, but only very lately has it been seen with the great Pulkowa Refractor; and thus we have another instance proving, as had already been done for the stars, that light can fix on a photographic plate the images of objects which can scarcely be seen, even with the largest telescopes. Nor is this the only advantage of photography when applied to the nebulae. It is chiefly valuable for its detailed accuracy in furnishing the only trustworthy criterion of change in those strange bodies. For, as all know, it is especially in the details that artists fail in reproducing the exact shape of the nebulae. Even the least source of information regarding

their forms is welcome, as they constitute so important a link in La Place's theory.

In the November meeting of our Academy of Science at Albany, Prof. E. C. Pickering, referring to the recent progress in celestial photography, made the following remarks: "The first stellar photographs ever taken were those of α Lyræ, by the elder Bond at the Harvard Observatory in 1850. In 1857 his son carried similar investigations much further. At first they had been unable to obtain clear images of stars of the second magnitude, while now it is possible to print those of the fourteenth, or, in other words, to transfer to paper an image produced by an object only a hundred-thousandth part as bright as formerly." He then goes on to expose the three different fields of investigation opened—first, that of mapping the heavens; second, that of studying stellar spectra; and finally, the determination of the amount of atmospheric absorption.

With regard to the first of these points, we may remark that a project is already on foot to obtain the co-operation of astronomers of different nations, many of whom are interested in this new work. They should all follow the same method, and portion out among themselves the heavens. One of Professor Pickering's aims is to further this project, so that before the close of the 19th century we may have a map of the universe with stars down to the fourteenth magnitude, all stamped in their true relative position. This, indeed, would be an arduous undertaking, and utterly to be despaired of did we rely on the artist, for the labor of an hour by the new process would cost the draughtsman months of toil.

The foregoing presents but a small portion of the work done by astrophotography, in which great progress has been made during the past few years. Want of space prevents us from dwelling at present upon other applications of the same process, to the determination of the connection between magnetic storms and the sun-spots and faculæ; to the reproduction of the exact appearance of the planets, especially of Venus at the moment of its transits, and to the mapping of the lines—the Fraunhofer lines—of the solar spectrum, which has been so successfully and exactly done by the Rowland's gratings. We may return to this subject at an early opportunity.

PHYSICS.

ELECTRICITY.

OF the many recent discoveries and researches made in this ever-increasing branch of science we will mention a few of more general interest.

As stated in most daily papers, Mr. Edison has very lately made, on the Staten Island Railway, several successful experiments of his system of inductive telegraphy. The idea is not new. A few years ago similar

successful attempts were made on the New York Central Railway with the Phelps system. This system, however, requires a specially laid wire between the tracks, while Mr. Edison uses the ordinary telegraph wires stretched along the road. We shall endeavor to explain, even without diagrams, the Edison method. The apparatus used, both on the train and at the fixed stations, consists of an ordinary Morse key, a vibrating reed, an induction coil and a battery, for sending the dispatches; and, for receiving them, of a phonetic receiver or telephone. The principle involved in this method is that of electric influence or induction. Whenever a current begins or ceases to traverse a wire, it produces an instantaneous current in a neighboring wire. This action is called induction. It is well known that if the telephone wires are strung close to the telegraph wires, the dispatches passing through the latter can be more or less easily heard. This fact, which in ordinary cases is an inconvenience, is ingeniously utilized by Edison in his new system for receiving dispatches, while similar currents are made use of for sending them.

Suppose a dispatch is to be sent. The two extremities of the secondary wire of the induction coil are respectively connected, one with the ground through the car-wheels, the other with the tin roof of all the cars of the train. In the circuit of the primary wire with the battery the Morse key is introduced, and also a vibrating reed, which is made to vibrate five hundred times a second by means of a small independent battery. The ordinary Morse alphabet is used. When the operator lowers the key, not one but many interrupted discharges pass through the primary wire. These are reproduced in the secondary wire, and are changed into currents of high tension, or potential, as they are technically called. These currents pass unto the car roofs, from which they affect the telegraph wires stretched along the road. If a phonetic receiver or telephone is interposed in the circuit of the line wire, an operator, at any fixed station, perceives the dots and dashes produced by the key on the train that sends the telegram.

At the fixed stations a similar apparatus sends induction-currents on the telegraph wires; the high potential currents passing through them affect the roofs of the moving cars. The induction currents communicated to the tin roofs pass through a phonetic receiver or telephone, and thus enable the operator on the car to perceive the dots and dashes of the key that transmits the message.

The system, which has been successfully tried, is on the point of being introduced on some railroads. As its expenses are very small, and its usefulness recognized on all sides, it will perhaps be adopted by most of the railroads of the country.

We take pleasure in announcing the fact that Mr. J. A. Maloney, of Washington, D. C., has quite recently patented a reversible telegraph key. There can be no doubt that this key, when more generally known, will prove to be of the greatest utility to telegraph operators. According to the method heretofore made use of, the operators when obliged to work for hours in succession oftentimes endured extreme fatigue, and not unfrequently became afflicted with what is called "operator's paralysis,"

brought about by the constant up and down motion of the hand pressed upon the key whilst sending the message. Now the very ingenious contrivance of Mr. Maloney has for its purpose to remedy this evil. In Mr. Maloney's invention, by a simple arrangement of a screw, the operator may in a few seconds cause the key to play from side to side, instead of the up and down movement. This change has proved to be a very great relief, so much so that persons already afflicted with the paralysis are enabled, by using this system, to continue their occupation. In a test case to which the recent invention was subjected, it was found that a person very badly afflicted with this paralysis, and who in the ordinary way could work the key but for a very few moments, was able to use the reversed one for hours without experiencing the slightest inconvenience.

Lately two authoritative reports have fallen into our hands which seem to settle that very practical question as to the relative merits and advantages of the electric light and other methods of illumination. Knowing as we do how often persons desirous of informing themselves on this subject are confronted with very questionable statements of parties interested in the one method or the other, we feel all the more inclined to place before our readers a summary of these reports, deeming them worthy of all reliance.

The recent experiment of the Franklin Institute upon incandescent and arc-lights, gives the following averages: one pound of anthracite, burned under a good boiler, yields in the incandescent system of lighting about 40 candles for an hour; the same weight of coal gives from the naked arc-light about 158 candles; as, however, the arc-lights are generally shaded, the intensity is so far diminished that it scarcely reaches 80 candles per pound. One pound of bituminous coal will yield from 5 to 6 feet of illuminating gas. This gas, in the argand burner, will yield from 14 to 17 candles. Illuminating gas is burned at once in the simplest manner, and the amount of machinery and care required by electric lighting offsets its greatest economy of fuel, light for light.

From the report of Trinity House, in England, on the inquiry into the relative merits of electricity, gas, and oil, the general conclusions arrived at by the committee were these: that the "electric light, as exhibited in the experimental tower of South Foreland, has proved to be the most powerful light under all conditions of weather, and to have the greatest penetrative power in fog"; and that for all practical purposes the gas and oil were equal. "For the ordinary necessities of light-house illumination mineral oil is the most suitable and economical illuminant, and that for salient headlands, important land-falls, and places where a very powerful light is required, electricity offers the greatest advantages."

Book Notices.

THE LIFE OF THE VERY REV. THOMAS N. BURKE, O.P. By *William J. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A.*, author of "The Life, Times and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin," "Ireland Before the Union," etc. London: C. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.; New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. 1886.

To some it may seem both strange and unfortunate that it should have been left to a layman to write the life of Father Burke. Yet, when all the circumstances are considered, it may be deemed fortunate that the Irish Dominican Father, who purposed undertaking the work, relinquished the idea. For, as the Right Rev. Bishop of Galway said, when unable to take the chair in furtherance of a memorial, that, "as Father Burke's mission was primarily with the laity," there was a special fitness in a layman taking the lead to perpetuate his memory.

The author has spared no pains in gathering information from reliable sources, not only in Ireland and England, but also from Rome and the United States, in all of which countries Father Burke's name has become a household word. He acknowledges himself under special obligations to the Provincial of the Irish Dominicans, to the Provincial of the English Dominicans, and to Major Haverty, of New York, for very valuable assistance.

In his preface, the author defends himself against the charge which he anticipates that some persons will make, that too much space has been given to portraying Father Burke as a humorist, and not enough to exhibiting him as a preacher whose sermons earned for him so high a reputation. From our first glance over the work, we thought the charge well founded. But, on a careful perusal of it, we became convinced that the author's treatment of his subject was correct and judicious. For, to suppress mention of Father Burke's irrepressible humor would be to destroy his individuality, as much so as to ignore his great and characteristic humility. The two, indeed, were inseparably interwoven, and the former was very often employed as a cloak to hide the latter. Then, too, Father Burke's sermons are familiar to all, but his inexhaustible fund of pleasant humor and ridicule, which were oftenest directed against himself and to his own intentional disparagement, are less well known, except to those who were in frequent and familiar intercourse with him. But there was also another side of Father Burke's life of which the world knew nothing—his wonderful interior life of fervent piety and profound devotion, in depicting which the author says he has been greatly aided by those who knew him best as priest, as monk, as conductor of retreats, and as discharging the duties of the various offices he held in the religious order of which he was a member.

The account of Father Burke's boyhood and youth is very detailed, and clearly traces the development during that period of his life of the characteristics which subsequently made him so distinguished. Widely as Father Burke was known as an eloquent preacher, there was much of his character and life of which the public knew nothing. It is quite commonly supposed that he owed his oratorical power entirely to his natural genius; that he owed what knowledge he possessed to an extraordinary memory which retained whatever he picked up by desultory

reading, but that he was neither an industrious student nor an accurate scholar. Yet this was a very erroneous impression. Father Burke was not a laborious student, in the common sense of the word, nor was he an extensive reader; but the studies he made were thoroughly mastered, and their principles and fundamental ideas grew and bore an abundance of rare and ripe fruit in the rich and deep soil of his extraordinary intellect. He knew St. Thomas Aquinas by heart. His questions and his method of analyzing and treating them, his objections and answers and arguments, were all at Father Burke's fingers' ends. At first thought, this seems strange. For, as regards the outward form in which they respectively discussed subjects and put their thoughts, there appears to be no similarity whatever between St. Thomas Aquinas and Father Burke. Yet this dissimilarity is in form and appearance only.

Father Burke understood too thoroughly the nature of his mission as a preacher, the character of the audiences he addressed, and the manner in which he could most effectually reach them and hold them, to employ scholastic forms and methods in his sermons or lectures. Yet his familiarity with those methods, and his habitual, and perhaps unconscious, use of them in gathering and arranging his ideas, formed, we believe, the secret of his wonderful quickness in preparing his discourses, and, indeed, in delivering, as he often did, seemingly without any previous thought or reflection, discourses which were masterpieces of overpowering eloquence. As St. Thomas would develop a whole treatise from a single axiomatic truth, so Father Burke would develop a sermon or a lecture from a single pregnant thought. The thought grew in his mind as he proceeded in his discourse. It put forth boughs and branches, and these clothed themselves with foliage and fruit, as does a tree under the influence of genial warmth and moisture.

But, to us, the most interesting part of Father Burke's life, and the one which is saddest, yet at the same time most glorious, is its latter part. For ten years before his death he was tortured with an excruciatingly painful disease. But, though his physical strength was waning and his body was tortured with pain, his intellectual power was undiminished, and his zeal and devotion to his mission as a preacher of the truth shone forth all the more brightly. Unsparing of self, devoted to his special work, he complied with every call that was made upon him, regardless of the physical suffering it caused him.

One of the brightest Christian virtues of Father Burke was his profound humility. Yet even this he concealed under a veil of seeming carelessness and indifference. His jocularity was often employed as a means for enduring and for momentarily forgetting the bodily pains with which he was tortured; and very often, too, he carried it to the extent of seeming frivolity in order to diminish the esteem in which he was deservedly held, and to prevent his election to offices of high ecclesiastical dignity.

To preach his last sermon, which was for the relief of poor starving children in Donegal, he dragged his pain-racked body from his cell at Tallaght, and travelled long and weary miles, that the board of those famished children might not be bare when he lay buried. The Dominican Brother who accompanied him feared that he would die on the road. Speaking of him on this occasion, Chief-Justice O'Hagan says: "Who that was present can forget the closing scene, when, with bent and broken form and faltering footstep, he ascended the pulpit to plead the cause of the starving children? Never in the brightest days of his career were his utterances more tender and impressive. But every lineament told of coming dissolution. He gathered together what remains

of life and fire were left within him to do this last act of charity and pity."

The work before us, from which we have gleaned these remarks, is a worthy tribute to the memory of the illustrious Father Thomas N. Burke, O.P.

THE SPIRITS OF DARKNESS AND THEIR MANIFESTATIONS ON EARTH: Or Ancient and Modern Spiritualism. By *John Gmeiner*, Professor in the Theological Seminary at St. Francis, Milwaukee Co., Wisconsin. Milwaukee and Chicago: Hoffmann Brothers, Catholic Publishers. 1886.

The popular way of accounting for the phenomena of Spiritism and the performances of persons who claim and profess to be mediums of spirits, is that all their manifestations are mere deceptions, similar to those performed by experts at tricks of sleight of hand. It is an easy method of explaining away these manifestations, and satisfies careless observers and superficial thinkers, and also the class of skeptics who are commonly called Agnostics. It receives seeming confirmation, too, from the fact that in many instances pretended spiritualistic mediums have been proven to be arrant impostors, and their deceptive methods and machinery have been detected and exposed. Owing to these facts, a large number of persons, and prominently among them distinguished materialistic scientists, have hastily concluded that all spiritualistic manifestations are mere tricks and delusive phenomena, and that there are no such real manifestations.

The mistake of those who thus reason is that their conclusion is broader than the facts from which they derive it. The fact that *some* pretended spiritualistic manifestations have been proven to be frauds is not a logical reason for believing that *all* of them are frauds. Yet such is the conclusion of many persons who, without serious thought, are inclined to disbelieve in the reality of spiritism.

Still another class of persons deny the possibility of such manifestations, because of their disbelief in all spiritual existence. They are *materialists*; they resolve all manifestations of being and existence into the action of mere material forces. According to them, our thoughts, our volitions, are nothing else than effects of these forces acting under certain conditions; man has no mind nor will, in the proper sense of those words; he has no soul; and all spiritual existences and God Himself are mere figments of the human imagination. Scientists who grovel in and are ruled by these false and impious notions, are compelled by logical consistency to explain away and entirely deny the reality of all spiritualistic manifestations, without regard to the overwhelming evidence of actuality with which they are, sometimes, accompanied and proved.

But, however strenuously these resolvers of all things into the sole action of material forces strive to deny alike the existence of God, of angels, of the human soul, and of the devil and the spirits of darkness, yet facts and logic, and reason, and Divine Revelation are too strong for them. In addition to the testimony of human consciousness, of the metaphysical arguments which prove the existence of the human soul, of angels and of God; in addition to the silent but eloquent testimony of the earth and the heavens, the spirits of darkness come forth at times from their abodes of torment and bear unintended, unwilling testimony to the same truths.

As regards this, *modern* spiritism has a somewhat like relation to the truth that the testimony of devils in the days of our Blessed Redeemer's

sojourn on earth, bore to the reality of His mission. They had no love for Him or for truth. Yet, against their own wicked wills their testimony was in favor of the truth.

These thoughts of our own, though suggested by an examination of Father Gmeiner's work, will furnish a clew to its general purpose as defined in the preface. His particular object is to "defend certain Christian doctrines against two classes of opponents," first, "against Materialists who, like the Sadducees of old, believe neither in angels nor devils; and secondly, against modern Spiritualists, who imagine that . . . a new revelation from the Unseen Above, superior to Christianity and destined to supersede it, has dawned upon mankind."

The author also modestly expresses the hope that "many a skeptically inclined Christian" may learn from a perusal of his treatise "that evil spirits really do exist among men; . . . that demoniacal possessions and apparitions . . . are by no means only products of the imagination; and that the exorcisms, the use of the Sign of the Cross, and of the Name of Jesus, and other means sanctioned by the Church to protect ourselves against 'the snares of the devil,' are by no means ridiculous or superstitious practices, as many enlightened people in this country are inclined to think."

Then, too, as the author suggests, the student of history will find many a fact and suggestion that will assist him in better understanding some of the most mysterious parts of human history, such as the oracles among ancient heathen nations, "the origin of false religions, the strange supermundane apparitions occasionally recorded, even by very sober historians," etc. Those, too, who are concerned about modern "spiritualism," "mind-reading," "thought-transference," "mind-cure," "psychometry," "hypnotism," "mesmerism," etc., will find in the volume before us many facts which will not only interest him, but go far towards explaining them.

INSTITUTIONES MORALES ALPHONSIANÆ: seu Doctoris Ecclesiæ S. Alphonsi Mariæ de Liguori Doctrina Moralis ad usum Scholarum accomodata, cura et studio P. Clementis Marc, Congreg. SSmi Redemptoris. Romæ: Ex. Typographia Iacis, Philippi Cuygiani. 1885. Two vols. Large 8vo. Vol. i., pp. xvi-911. Vol. ii., pp. 837.

The aim of Father Marc in undertaking this laborious and excellent compilation was, as he himself tells the reader, to develop accurately and clothe with scientific form the entire moral system of St. Alphonsus, which lay scattered in several distinct works, and in so many and varied editions of his "Moral Theology." To render himself competent for the task, he not only devoted years of assiduous study to the published writings of the Saint, but also made careful use of what providentially fell into his hands—a great number of notes and letters on moral subjects which lay hidden, unknown and unpublished for nearly a whole century after the Saint's death. He declares that these letters have enabled him to throw light upon several points, which were not explained clearly enough (*non ita perspicue expositæ*) in the "Moral Theology" of St. Alphonsus.

Some theologians prefer to follow the method of St. Thomas, who, in treating of the natural law and its obligations, arranges the latter under the head of the various virtues and the connection by which they are logically held together. Our author, however, adheres to the order of St. Alphonsus, and modern theologians generally, who treat of these

duties and obligations according to their relative dignity and importance, in which they have for guide the Decalogue itself. Yet, not to neglect altogether the method of the angelic doctor, which is more scientific, he follows the usual practice of most theologians of later date, and towards the end of what may be called general "Moral Theology," gives a treatise *De Virtutibus in Genere*, which serves as a stepping-stone to what is known as special "Moral Theology." Indeed, as the author well remarks, the proper place for such a treatise should be, not after, but before that *De Peccatis*, since duty or obligation is, in the logical order, prior to breach or transgression of the same.

The author, in his preface, states that he has treated at some length and (he adds) with careful investigation, the whole subject of Probabilism, with a view to establish with certainty what he calls the "Moral System of the Holy Doctor, Alphonsus." This, as was to be expected, he stoutly maintains to have been no other than Equiprobabilism.¹ But his reasoning, we fear, acute as it is, will not convince all readers. It has not convinced many learned clergymen, religious and secular, who have reviewed his work. We have no wish to argue the point, even if our space allowed such discussion. We will merely say that, in default of every other reason, reverence alone for the great Saint would incline us to the contrary opinion. If any one wishes to hear the arguments on the other side, he can find a brief but lucid statement of them in F. Aloysius Sabetti's excellent "Compendium Theologiæ Moralis," printed at Woodstock, Maryland, in 1884 (pp. 51-57). Besides, the whole difficulty in reality seems to be more speculative than practical. And we feel sure that, in administering the Sacrament of Penance, the children of St. Ignatius and the disciples of St. Alphonsus—as they have in view the same end, the glory of God and the salvation of souls—follow pretty much the same grand rule, derived from priority of right, or, as it is called, possession. *Melior est conditio possidentis*. It would be well if some one would translate into Latin, for the general use of students of Moral Theology, Gianvincenzo Bolgeni's admirable book, entitled, "Il Possesso, Principio fondamentale per decidere i Casi Morali," reprinted at Rome, in 1847, by Monaldini.

F. Marc's work, besides being clearly written, and containing many wholesome practical hints for pastors and confessors, makes the reader acquainted with many provisions of the civil law in Germany, France, etc., which may be very useful to the theological student, not only in Europe, but likewise in this country.

Apart from its learning and clearness of style, F. Marc's book would be worthy of commendation on the score alone that it gives the student a fair digest of the opinions of St. Alphonsus on doubtful moral questions. The Saint's writings are not infallible, and any one, who feels so inclined, may take, for his guides, Toletus, Suarez, De Lugo and others, whom the Saint himself venerated as classical theologians of the first rank. But there is this legitimate prejudice in favor of St. Alphonsus, that the Holy See, while passively allowing a confessor to trust to the guidance of those illustrious theologians, has declared him to be safe in adhering to the opinions of St. Alphonsus. Hence, it was not without reason that Cardinal Sanfelice, the present archbishop of Naples, declared officially in his diocesan Synod, four years ago: "Experientia teste, ille confessarius uberiores fructus colliget, qui in confessionario sententiis et praxi Ligorianæ propius accesserit." (Synod. Dioce. Neapol., Jun., 1882.)

¹ Equiprobabilismus.

THE THIRTY YEARS: Our Lord's Infancy and Hidden Life. By *Henry James Coleridge*, of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates. 1885.

This volume completes the first part of Father Coleridge's admirable work entitled "The Life of Our Lord," of which a number of volumes on subsequent periods of the Life of our Blessed Redeemer have already appeared.

It has often been a matter of wonder to those who have attentively studied the writings of the holy Evangelists, how little is said by them respecting these thirty years of our Divine Lord's existence on earth. Yet while this fact may well excite devout astonishment, it also furnishes convincing proof of the truth that the revelations of God to us are to be "measured not by the multitude of words in which they are conveyed, but by the importance of the matters of which they speak." Of this we have a most frequent and convincing example in the method adopted by our Lord Himself. In the course of His teaching, He laid down His doctrines concerning most vital points in His work in the fewest possible words, as when He spoke of the Blessed Sacrament, the Adorable Sacrifice, the Priesthood, the Power of Absolution, and the like. In similar manner the Holy Evangelists have been guided by Divine inspiration to a silence, or, when they do speak, to a brevity on the subjects treated of in this volume, and in others on other like subjects, which may remind us of the extreme fewness of our Divine Lord's own words, and of the wonderful pregnancy of the few words which the Holy Evangelists have recorded as spoken by Him.

These remarks apply directly and most fully to that most wonderful portion of our Lord's sojourn on earth commonly called "His Hidden Life."

"It is with regard to that long period," says Father Coleridge, "that we are most tempted to let our human and inadequate ideas of the virtue and power of the interior life of prayer and communion with God for the carrying on of His work in the world, make us feel impatient of what seems inaction at a time when action was, according to poor human judgments, most needed." We forget that even in His Public Ministry there were periods of retirement and silence,—at all events periods of which little account has been given,—and of which we know and have no means of knowing scarcely anything. Then, too, if we study the Lives of the Saints, which are a practical commentary on the Life of our Lord, we shall find but very few, even of the most active workers and preachers among them, who have not had their activity thus broken up. "The most fruitful activity in the sight of God is the activity of prayer."

But while the accounts of our Divine Lord's "Hidden Life" on earth are few and brief, yet, if devoutly studied and pondered over, they are deeply significant and pregnant with spiritual instruction. As we learn the great dignity of the Apostles from the manner in which our Lord gave Himself up to their training at the very time that He was in the midst of His Public Ministry, so, too, we may learn in the same way the importance in His sight of bringing to the utmost perfection the magnificent work of God in the souls of Mary and Joseph, from the length of time during which this was His chief and chosen occupation. The external course of the Hidden Life at Nazareth, too, says Father Coleridge, "was probably as uniform and same as is that of the lives of good religious in some peaceful house of prayer and contemplation." Then, too, there are analogies between the Life at Nazareth and the various phases and conditions of the common life of Christians,

which, if carefully studied, furnish an immense treasure of spiritual instruction.

In pursuance of these ideas, Father Coleridge devotes the volume before us to a careful examination of what the Sacred Scriptures record respecting this period of our Blessed Redeemer's existence on earth. The Nativity of our Lord, the apparition of the angels to the shepherds, our Lord in the crib, the Circumcision, the canticle of Simeon, the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the holy innocents, the return from Egypt, the Hidden Life at Nazareth, our Lord at Jerusalem, His subjection and growth, the death of St. Joseph, and other subjects involved in the thirty years' life of our Blessed Redeemer before He entered upon His Public Ministry, are carefully and profoundly examined and discussed by Father Coleridge.

On some points the revered writer differs from the opinions commonly entertained, but he not only adduces strong reasons of his own in support of the conclusions at which he arrives, but gives them confirmatory strength by references to like opinions entertained by early Church Fathers and eminent theologians. The work is evidently the result of extensive research, of careful study, and of devout and profound meditation.

KING EDWARD THE SIXTH, SUPREME HEAD: An Historical Sketch, with an Introduction and Notes. By *Frederick George Lee, D.D.*, author of "Historical Sketches of the Reformation," "The Church under Queen Elizabeth," etc. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. 1886.

The author of this work is an Anglican clergyman, and Vicar of Lambeth. Having free access to the archives of the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth, he availed himself of it to examine the letters, records, and other documents that were stowed away and buried from public knowledge, and particularly those of the times of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth. In "Historical Sketches of the Reformation," and "The Church under Queen Elizabeth," and other historical works, he published some of the results of his examination. But the exposure of the meanness, cruelty, treachery, and immorality of the leading workers in the so-called Reformation movement in England, was so damaging to the Anglican Church that further examination of the archives relating to those times was prohibited.

The work before us may be regarded as a sequel to the author's previous publications. It is a strange book for an Anglican clergyman to write—that is, for an Anglican who really believes in Anglicanism. From original letters and documents, he makes the leading men who figured most prominently in the political and religious movements of the time of Edward VI. to tell the story of their own terrible wickedness, and to paint their own portraits. And a horrible story of deceit, falsehood, perjury, selfishness, cupidity, ambition, and fanatical cruelty it is. Were it not that the men who were the founders of the Anglican Church, and whom Episcopalians professedly regard as saints, speak through their own letters and papers, it could scarcely be believed that wretches so base and corrupt, and so devoid of manly and moral principles, could care or dare to attempt to hide their vices and their crimes under the garb of piety and zeal for religion. But there are no limits to cowardice and hypocrisy, and the English "Reformers" were at once cruel tyrants and base hypocrites and cowards.

If this language seems too strong, it is only necessary to glance over the work before us and read the extracts it contains from original docu-

ments of unquestioned authenticity, showing what manner of men Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Bruce, Peter Martyr, and a host of others, all promoters of the "Reformation" in England, really were. They live again in the records of their words and deeds contained in the work before us.

In like manner the author shows the awful impiety, profanity, and coarseness of these "Reformers" and their followers.

"Believing themselves," he says, "to have become the custodians of a new and more comfortable revelation, they treated with the most impious language and the most towering contempt the religion and the sacred rites of the august and divinely-guided Church of God. Everything that lying ribaldry and misrepresentation could do in the work of destruction, and to delude and mislead the afflicted populace, was done with energy and great determination of purpose. Vile fly-leaves, false and libellous in their statements, were printed abroad, imported hither, and circulated widely; blasphemous verses, set forth in black-letter, and filthy jokes concerning the most sacred subjects, were propounded and distributed."

In like manner the author shows, from authentic official documents, the stealings and robberies, and desecration and destruction of churches, sacred shrines, convents, and hospitals, from which these "*Reformers*" enriched themselves and their followers, or against which they vented their impious malice.

The work is full of rare and valuable information, the result of examining documents, many of which are hidden away in the secret archives of Lambeth Palace.

THE PARNELL MOVEMENT; WITH A SKETCH OF IRISH PARTIES FROM 1843. By T. P. O'Connor, M.P., author of "Lord Beaconsfield, a Biography;" "Gladstone's House of Commons," etc. Authorized edition. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. 1886.

The story of Ireland's struggle for long centuries against oppression and tyranny and cruel legislation, sometimes intentionally framed to impoverish and destroy her people, sometimes designed to slightly alleviate their miseries, but which, framed by an alien, often intensified the suffering they intended to lessen, has been told by many writers, each occupying a different point of view. It is scarcely possible, therefore, that any new or original information can now be produced. Still less is this the case with respect to the events which concern Ireland during the last forty-five years. These are facts of contemporaneous history within the memory almost of the present generation.

The reader of this volume could scarcely expect to find any new historical facts or fuller interpretations of them in its pages. Its value consists in the clear and concise narration of well-known events, and in its interesting biographical sketches and clear-cut, distinct word-pictures of the leading men, whose actions and influence, both for weal and for woe, contributed chiefly to shape the history of Ireland during the last forty-five years.

Indeed, as the author states at the commencement of the first chapter of his work, his "main purpose is to describe the movement which is associated with the name of Mr. Parnell." But, as he also says, "that movement cannot be understood without some acquaintance with other movements, of which it is the child and successor." For this reason he has thought it best to go back a short time and start with the year 1843.

The author's first chapter is entitled "The Fall of O'Connell," and

the animus with which it is written may be inferred from the first remark respecting O'Connell: "The Irish people," says the writer, "may be *excused* (the italics are ours) for the honor they paid to O'Connell after he had won for them Catholic Emancipation." Following this are successive chapters on "The Coming of the Famine," "The Famine," "The Great Clearances." Then follows a chapter on "The Great Betrayal," narrating the treachery of Keogh, its antecedents, concomitant events, and its resulting consequences.

Succeeding this are chapters on the utter ruin and cruel evictions which followed; on the revolutionary schemes and movements that were attempted; on Isaac Butt; on the famine of 1879; on the "Land League," and the "Coercion Struggle."

The last chapter contains an account of the last general election of members of Parliament and its results.

Interspersed in the various chapters of the work are numerous interesting biographical and personal sketches of Ireland's present leading men, drawn with a free hand. Among them, we need not say, Mr. Parnell occupies a prominent place. The value of the work is further enhanced by a number of statistical tables, and by numerous quotations from official reports and other documents, showing the actual condition of Ireland at different times, and the misery inflicted on the people by landlordism and oppressive legislation.

THE TRUTH ABOUT JOHN WYCLIF, HIS LIFE, WRITINGS AND OPINIONS: Chiefly from the Evidence of his Contemporaries. By *Rev. Joseph Stevenson, S. J.* London: Burns & Oates. 1885.

Protestants, in their desperate efforts to establish a precedent for the religious revolt of the sixteenth century, have been at great pains to apotheosize such characters as Huss and Wyclif. So anxious have they been to build their vain hopes upon the teachings of these rebels against spiritual and temporal authority that they have not even taken the trouble to study their private lives and public careers, leaving this duty to opponents who are now using it to the advantage of the true Church, and the discredit and eternal shame of schism. The task, as regards Wyclif, could have fallen into no better hands than those of Fr. Stevenson, who, in this octavo volume of a little more than two hundred pages, gives the best picture yet presented of the religious state of England in the fourteenth century. The learned Jesuit, who had already done so much to set the public mind right regarding Mary Stuart, evidently possesses the genius of the true historian.

Wyclif's recommendation is, as Father Stevenson tersely remarks, "that he rebelled against the authorities of his ecclesiastical superiors, and persisted till his death in his rebellion. If it be suggested that he died an excommunicated heretic, the fact, if recognized, seems rather to add to his reputation. If we venture to remind the admirers of his principles that these same principles in former days endangered the security of the Church and the crown, led to the murder of an Archbishop of Canterbury on Tower Hill, and deluged London with the blood of her best citizens, the intelligence makes no lasting impression. . . . Wyclif serves to keep alive, perhaps not altogether unprofitably, the flagging zeal of a certain class of believers in the great Protestant tradition. . . . We venture to remind our countrymen that they do not know much about their hero, and that the little which they do know is not altogether to his credit. He died outside the Church; he taught doctrines subversive of religion, morality, civil government

and social order; but we speak in vain. Ignorance easily gives its admiration to a noisy innovator, especially when he becomes insubordinate and uses strong language." Thus tersely does our author set forth in his preface the character of the heresiarch, and the true reason why he is held in such high honor and esteem in certain so-called "respectable" quarters. Referring again to this latter point, in connection with the Wyclif centenary, he justly says that "the men who are so hard upon us poor Catholics for commemorating the examples of God's saints, and the sufferings of God's martyrs, have now, themselves, furnished us with a sufficient answer to their own accusations. When we find them professing a veneration, at once exaggerated and unauthorized, for an individual whose errors and extravagances are much more conspicuous than his sanctity, we ask them to bear with our respect towards such men as St. Augustine, St. Anselm and St. Thomas of Canterbury, and to permit us to prefer our saints to theirs." Much more to this effect we might quote from the book before us, as well as an excellent summary of the politico-religious perturbator's unsavory career, were space at our disposal; but we take great pleasure in referring our readers to the pages of the book itself, in which they cannot fail to be absorbingly interested.

THE CAUSE OF IRELAND PLEADED BEFORE THE CIVILIZED WORLD. By *Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, L.D.* (Laval). New York: P. F. Collier, Publisher.

The motive of this book is well expressed in the following words, taken from its preface: "No one, however, on either side of the Atlantic, or on any point of either hemisphere where Irish hearts beat responsive to Ireland's fears and hopes, but must have read in the signs of the times that the crisis of her fate has come; and that, if all her sons, at home and abroad, will only be true to her NOW, and do, each, a true man's part to help her, success is as surely to be won within the next decade—perhaps, within the next year—as the sun which sets to-day will rise to-morrow." The author goes on to say that the conviction that this crisis had come in Irish affairs impelled him, after fifty-three years' absence from his native country, to revisit it, that he might see with his "own eyes the land and the people," and do what he might and could "towards helping the sacred cause at a time when every day and hour is pregnant with the fate of the Nation."

Out of this conviction and action the book before us has grown and been published. The author, first, briefly states Ireland's case,—the grounds on which the plea for justice to her is founded. He addresses this plea "to the great tribunal of public opinion, and, through it, to the conscience of all mankind." He then brings it home to Englishmen, by showing that they are, directly, deeply interested in fully knowing the wrong which they have done to Ireland.

The author then divides his work into five chief divisions or parts. In the first of these he shows what was the condition of the country and people before the English invasion. The second part he devotes to an historical exhibit of the "Land Question" in Ireland, and of the people and country under English methods of "civilizing" (?) them. Part third treats of the period of "Plantation and Extermination." Part fourth, of "Cromwell and his Atrocious Measures." Part fifth, of "The Last Long Period of Wrong" (1660–1885).

In separate chapters, and separate subdivisions, the different subjects, which these main divisions embrace, are clearly exhibited and discussed. In the concluding chapter, the manner in which "England's manifold injustice must be repaired" is pointed out. The chief points are:

· Make Ireland a field of profitable labor ; reconstruct the land laws and the land courts ; coerce the landlords ; protect the tenants ; protect and encourage the fishermen, and develop the fisheries ; resuscitate Irish industry and trade ; abolish Castle rule ; RESTORE SELF-GOVERNMENT TO IRELAND.

PREPARATION FOR DEATH ; OR CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ETERNAL TRUTHS, USEFUL FOR ALL AS MEDITATIONS, AND SERVICEABLE TO PRIESTS FOR SERMONS. (Maxims of Eternity—Rule of Life.) By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis : Benziger Brothers. 1886.

This is the first volume of the "Centennial Edition" of the works of St. Alphonsus, "a new and only complete" edition of the ascetical and dogmatical treatises. The works of the Saint relating to "Moral Theology," and written by him in Latin, will remain untranslated. As regards the arrangement of matter, this English edition is based on the French translation from the Italian of Fathers Leopold Dujardin and Jules Jacques, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, published in twenty-seven volumes.

The aim of this work is two-fold : First, it is intended for the use of all persons who desire to establish themselves in virtue and to advance in spiritual life. Secondly, it furnishes a collection of matter suitable for sermons at missions and the spiritual exercises. To render it more useful for seculars, the several considerations are each divided into three points. Each point serves as one meditation, and to each of these are annexed "affections and prayers." To render the considerations more useful to preachers having but few books and little time for reading texts of Scripture and passages from the Fathers, brief, but strong and animated, maxims are added. Appended to the work is "A Christian's Rule of Life."

In view of the high place which St. Alphonsus' writings occupy in the estimation of holy doctors and theologians of the Church, and of the emphatic approvals of them by numerous Sovereign Pontiffs from Benedict XIV. to Pius IX. and Leo XIII., it would be not only gratuitous, but presumptuous, to add anything in commendation of this excellent work.

SADLIER'S CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, ALMANAC AND ORDO FOR THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1886. With full Official Reports of all Dioceses, Vicariates, Prefectures, etc., in the United States, Canada, British West Indies, Ireland, England, and Scotland. New York and Montreal: D. & J. Sadlier & Co.

HOFFMANN'S CATHOLIC DIRECTORY AND CLERGY-LIST QUARTERLY, 1886. Milwaukee and Chicago: Hoffmann Brothers, Catholic Book Publishers.

An annual Catholic "Directory" of the Dioceses, Churches, Clergy, etc., in the United States, with ecclesiastical statistics as full and accurate as possible, is almost indispensably requisite to bishops and clergy of the Catholic Church in the United States. As will be seen by the titles of the above named publications, there are now two of these works competing for public favor.

The volume by Sadlier & Co., which is before us, comprises, in addition to the United States, Canada, British West Indies, Ireland, England and Scotland. The volume by Hoffmann Brothers is confined to the United States. The price of Sadlier's & Co. is \$1.25 ; but they issue a fifty-cent edition also, containing only the United States portion of the work. That of Hoffmann Brothers is fifty cents. The latter-named firm also announce that they will publish, quarterly, a corrected Clergy-list, which will be sent, free of charge, to every subscriber to the Directory. The object of publishing this corrected Clergy-list is to note in

it all changes that occur during each three months, and thus make the Directory as accurate at the close of each year as at its beginning.

ELEMENTARY TREATISE ON ALGEBRA: For the Use of Beginners. By *Joseph Bayma, S. J.*, Professor of Mathematics in Santa Clara College, California. San Francisco: A. Waldteufel. 1885.

ELEMENTS OF GEOMETRY: For the Use of Beginners. By the same author, and the same publisher.

In his preface to the former of the above-named treatises, the learned author says that he has made it a point to be as plain and as brief as possible, in order that students of his treatise may look upon it as a pleasurable distraction, rather than an additional burden. In this purpose, we think, he has admirably succeeded. His definitions, rules and explanations are models of simplicity, clearness and conciseness. The examples under each rule and subject are well chosen, and sufficiently numerous to test and exercise the student's faculties.

The treatise on Geometry is condensed in like manner, because, Father Bayma says, while "comprehensive books are very useful in the hands of those whose minds are already formed, experience shows that a judicious parsimony proves more successful in encouraging the mental efforts of young beginners." The order and method which Father Bayma has adopted, and the proofs he has selected, are well calculated to save the student from unnecessary labor, and yet, at the same time, to exercise his understanding, and "foster his industry."

PRAXIS SYNODALIS. Manuale Synodi Diœcesanæ ac Provincialis celebrandæ. Editio (altera) emendata. Neo-Eboraci: Benziger Fratres. 1886. 12 mo., pp. 96.

This valuable little book is based on the work of the celebrated Bartholomew Gavantus, bearing the same title, and which is reprinted in most editions of his "Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum." But it adds, what is wanting in Gavantus, the ceremonies, formularies, etc., that are needed for the celebration of a Provincial Council. These, as the compiler remarks, are taken chiefly from the Councils of Vienna, Prague and Cologne, held in the years 1858 and 1860. The first edition appeared three years ago, and was then generally supposed to be the work of the present Most Rev. Archbishop of New York. But the name of the true author, Rev. Sebastian G. Messemer, is given in this second, corrected edition. The Rev. gentleman was one of the Secretaries of the late Plenary Council, and belongs to the Diocese of Newark. One of the chief merits of this little book is the *lucidus ordo* that pervades it from beginning to end, as Archbishop Corrigan well remarks in his Introduction.

MONTH OF MAY; OR A SERIES OF MEDITATIONS ON THE MYSTERIES OF THE LIFE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN, AND THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF SALVATION, FOR EACH DAY OF THE MONTH OF MAY. From the French of *Father Debussi, S. J.* Translated by Miss Ella McMahon. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Bros., 1886.

A SHORT AND PRACTICAL MAY DEVOTION. Compiled by *Clementinus Deymann, O.S.F.* New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

These are two most excellent books of devotion, and each has merits distinguishing it from the other. The former, which is much the larger, has, we are glad to see by the title-page, reached the fourth edition, and the latter ought to be at least equally popular. In order to meet the means of the masses it is gotten out in cheap form, in strong paper cover, but well printed on good paper. The other is also a fine specimen of bookmaking. Both bear the stamp of high episcopal authorization.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—JULY, 1886.—No. 43.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ANATOMICAL ANOMALIES.

Les Anomalies Musculaires chez l'Homme expliquées par l'Anatomie Comparée-leur importance en Anthropologie. Par le Docteur L. Testut. Preface par M. le Prof. Duval. Paris, 1884. G. Masson,

I.

IT is a well-recognized fact that very frequently deviations from the usual structure are found in the human body. This is true of all the systems, of the bones, ligaments, muscles, blood-vessels, nerves, and of the internal organs. Sometimes the peculiarity is simply an increase or diminution in size of some particular muscle, artery, or bony prominence. Sometimes an artery or a nerve supplies by its branches a somewhat larger or smaller expanse than usual. Sometimes two neighboring muscles are more or less fused together, or the split that partially divides a muscle may be uncommonly deep. It is needless to say that, though the knowledge of these variations may sometimes be of great value to the surgeon, and that therefore they should be carefully studied, still they are of little scientific interest. But there are other variations of which this cannot be said, which, on the contrary, are of great importance on account of the bearing their interpretation may have on the great questions of the day. These are such as occasionally reproduce in the body of man forms of structure that are normal in the bodies of lower animals. It must not be sup-

posed that the peculiarities referred to are of the nature of monstrosities or the result of morbid processes. For the most part they are not recognized during life, and have little or no influence for better or worse on the health of the individual. Before considering them in detail, let us glance at a few points in the structure and development of the bodies of man and of other vertebrate animals.

It is evident that they are built on the same general plan. They have a backbone, a spinal cord above it (in the upright position behind it) which enlarges in front (or above) into a brain. On the other side of the vertebral column are the digestive tract, the respiratory and circulatory systems. The extremities in all the higher animals are evidently modifications of the same type. Great as are the bodily differences between man and the nearest animals, they are differences of degree and not of kind.

When we examine the early embryonic stages of man and other mammals, the resemblance is increased. This is not in itself surprising, as it is but natural that the outlines of structure should appear first, and specific differences later; but what is very remarkable is that the embryos of higher animals present as transitory features structures that are permanent in lower ones. On the strength of this it has been asserted that the individual embryo rapidly runs through the changes that its ancestors have undergone in their progress up the zoological ladder. It is clear that this is assuming much more than we know. Not only does it beg the question of descent, but it is far from the demonstrated fact that it is passed off for. But however much the facts have been misinterpreted and the claims exaggerated, there remains something. We may at least say that the human embryo has certain transient features that are permanent in some lower animals.

In early stages of the vertebrate embryo the arteries make a series of arches in the neck closely resembling the permanent disposition of the main trunks in the gills of fishes. The minute openings which we sometimes see in the neck or about the ear of grown persons are explained as remnants of branchial clefts which once existed between these arteries. Of the five arterial arches on either side of the middle line, not necessarily existing at once, some remain pervious and some close up and disappear. Those that remain form the great vessels of the top of the chest and of the neck. Now in different classes of vertebrate animals, though the ground-plan is the same, the permanent arrangement is not. Thus in reptiles certain vessels remaining open form a double arch of the aorta, the great vessel that carries the blood from the heart; but in birds the vessel of one side is obliterated at an early period, so that there is but a single arch of the aorta which loops over the

right division of the windpipe. In mammals the vessel of the right side disappears and the aorta crosses the left air-tube.

Let us cite a few other examples relating to particular parts. The kidney in the human embryo is lobulated as in many animals, though it is smooth in the adult. Some muscles and tendons in the extremities have ape-like proportions. A certain fissure in the brain (*the external parieto-occipital*), which is well marked in apes, appears early in the human being and soon dwindles almost to nothing. Darwin laid much stress on the curious fact that the immature whalebone whale has teeth which never cut the gum and ultimately disappear.

These transitory stages being over and the animal having reached its adult state, there are found a number of so-called rudimentary organs, neither useful nor ornamental, which represent structures that have their uses in other species. These constitute a class of phenomena nearly allied to the anomalies that form the subject of this paper, but differing from them by being constant instead of only exceptionally present. The resemblance is the greater because these useless rudimentary organs are particularly prone to vary. A familiar example are the little ear muscles by which the shape of the outer ear may be changed in certain animals, but which in man are quite inert. Another instance is a thin layer of muscular fibres under the skin of the neck which represents a layer extending over most of the body by which many animals can wrinkle their skins so as to shake off insects or water. There is reason to believe that several other parts of the human body should be classed as rudimentary organs.

Let us now consider the body from another point of view. We have said that the bodies of vertebrate animals are built on a common plan, and the word "plan" was used advisedly. There is beyond question a certain symmetry and correspondence of parts in animals which is somewhat analagous to crystallization in inorganic matter. In vertebrates there is lateral symmetry or resemblance between the two sides, a serial homology between different segments of the body and between the extremities. Thus the shoulder and the hip, the arm and the thigh, the elbow and knee, the forearm and leg, the wrist and ankle, the hand and foot, evidently correspond in some way to one another. The precise nature of the correspondence between the limbs is a disputed point. Most authorities hold that the hind limbs are serial repetitions of the fore ones; others, that the front half of the body is to be compared to the hind half as the right is to the left, in which case it must be assumed that the homologue of the head remains rudimentary or is suppressed. A vast amount has been written on the subject. Attempts have been made to show homologies between

particular bones, muscles, arteries, and nerves according to various systems, and not a little confusion has resulted. In work of this kind the imagination must be kept well in hand. One considers with astonishment what utter trash has been written by really able men, bringing undeserved discredit on this field of research. The truth has been hidden by exaggerations. Because transcendental anatomists wrote nonsense, many have over hastily assumed that the underlying idea is a delusion. The trouble has been that the transcendentalists attempted too much. The data were wanting for even much more general comparisons than they instituted. No unbiassed mind, however, can fail to recognize symmetry in the individual and homology in different species. The arm is very different in man, the tiger, the horse, the bat, the seal, the eagle, the penguin, and the turtle; but in each of these there is an evident correspondence of parts with those in others and also with those in the hind limb of the same animal.

II.

Let us now pass in review some of the anomalies that are occasionally found in man. Very rarely a knob is seen projecting downward from the under surface of the base of the skull near the spine. Most books on human anatomy say nothing of it, and the student who knows nothing of comparative anatomy would be quite at a loss to account for it; but it represents a structure found in many mammals. It is greatly developed in several of the ungulata, as the sheep, the horse, the rhinoceros, etc. Again we occasionally meet with a hook-like bony excrescence from the humerus, a little above the inner side of the elbow, from which a fibrous band makes a bridge over an opening which corresponds to a hole in the bone in some apes, in some carnivora, and in some species of other orders through which an important nerve and artery pass. It is generally taught that this arrangement serves to protect these structures from pressure during the long continued contraction of some of the muscles. Be that as it may, if it is of any use in man, which may be doubted, the favored possessors of this structure are few and far between. Some authorities state that it occurs about three times in a hundred, but the writer's experience leads him to believe that it is much rarer. Remarkable anomalies are found in the large bloodvessels (those in the small are too numerous to discuss) depending on the irregular persistence or closure of the branchial arteries already mentioned. Sometimes the aorta arches over the right bronchus, as in birds, sometimes there is a double arch, as in reptiles.

Anomalies of the muscular system are very numerous and in-

teresting, but one or two instances will suffice. In man there are two deep muscles in the front of the forearm, of which one is the long flexor of the thumb, the other the deep flexor of the fingers. In apes, the thumb being comparatively unimportant, its long flexor is either wanting or more or less fused with that of the fingers. Now it is extremely common to find in man the long flexor of the thumb connected by a fleshy mass with either the deep or the superficial flexor of the fingers. The degree of fusion varies, and is found to correspond now to the condition in one ape, now to that in another. Just how far this correspondence may be purely accidental cannot be determined. Let us pass from the hand to the foot where there is a more striking instance. In apes the great toe has very free motion and is functionally much of a thumb, having a long abductor muscle pulling the toe away from the foot, which in man is quite wanting. Nothing could be more natural, one at first exclaims; but why is it that this muscle appears occasionally in man without any corresponding change in the articulations of the foot to permit increased motion? The anomalies of the muscular system are not merely such as have their analogies in animals near to man; they embrace an immense range. The arrangement represented may belong to members of very distant and aberrant mammalian orders, and even to birds, reptiles and amphibians.

Owing to the large number of human bodies dissected every year, we are more familiar with the anomalies of man than with those of the lower animals, but there is no doubt that similar variations occur in the latter. In studying the meaning of these phenomena it is clear that we must look for an explanation that will apply to all cases.

The appearances in question have always furnished one of the favorite arguments of evolutionists. How, they ask, can these things be accounted for on the theory of special creation? What possible explanation of them can be given if man and the animals each appeared in their present condition? Darwin wrote of rudimentary organs, and doubtless meant to apply the same reasoning to anomalies, that to understand them "we have only to suppose that a former progenitor possessed the parts in question in a perfect state, and that under changed habits of life they became greatly reduced. Thus we can understand how it has come to pass that man and all other vertebrate animals have been constructed on the same general model, why they pass through the same early stages of development, and why they contain certain rudiments in common. Consequently we ought frankly to admit their community of descent; to take any other view is to admit that our own structure, and that of all the animals around us, is a mere snare laid to entrap

our judgment."¹ In an earlier work he wrote: "Rudimentary organs may be compared with the letters of a word, still retained in the spelling but become useless in the pronunciation, but which serve as a clue to its derivation. On the view of descent with modification we may conclude that the existence of organs in a rudimentary, imperfect, and useless condition, or quite aborted, far from presenting a strange difficulty, as they assuredly do on the ordinary doctrine of creation, might even have been anticipated in accordance with the view here explained."²

That they present great difficulties, according to crude notions of special creation, must be conceded; but let us first see whether evolution offers as simple and satisfactory an explanation as these quotations would imply. Dr. Testut's book, the title of which is at the head of this article, is a very valuable addition to anatomical literature. The author discusses the anomalies of muscles with great care, giving the references to the original articles. The account of each anomaly is followed by a list of the animals in which the arrangement in question is the normal one. The book is marred, however, by unphilosophical reasoning. It is but fair to mention that Professor Duval, who wrote the preface, seems in this respect a more pronounced offender than the author. The preface is, indeed, so admirable an example of pseudo-science that a short extract may be allowed:

"The doctrine of transformism, so wonderfully started by Lamarck, so perfectly established by Darwin, has shown that individual variation may be divided into two orders of facts which are absolutely distinct as to significance and origin, but have in common the laws of heredity which they obey, and those of transformism of species of which they are the manifestations. In short, of these two orders of variations the one is in a manner a step towards the future, that is, towards transformations yet to come, the other a return to the past, that is, towards changes already accomplished. The former are progressive anomalies, the latter retrogressive ones."

Who would not suppose from the absolute complacency with which this is laid down that these statements rested on fact instead of on theories? The pity is the greater because the book, as was said before, is an excellent one so long as the author keeps to facts and avoids theories. One is inclined to exclaim with Father Harper: "Why cannot we have the simple facts of experience and observation, without being persecuted at every turn with a *view*?"

Who can tell how much harm such books do, not to the Catholic student who is true to himself, but to the graduates of Protestant colleges? It is not to be expected that they should sus-

¹ The Descent of Man, Chap. 7.

² The Origin of Species, Chap. 13.

pect learned men of writing arrant nonsense, of giving as truth what is but conjecture, of declaring proved what is obviously mere assertion. Such young men deserve great sympathy. If they take chaff for wheat it is often because they know no better. The lies of centuries have given them a false idea of the Catholic Church. They have brains enough to see that Protestantism is a failure. What is left them? How can they, humanly speaking, escape being deceived by a false philosophy? There are signs in plenty that many would gladly accept better things if they had them.

Returning from this digression, to give an example of the subject itself as well as of Dr. Testut's method of treating it, let us briefly review his "explanation" of the anomalies of the biceps. This muscle runs between the shoulder-blade and the fore-arm. It arises by two heads, whence its name, one called the long head springing from the glenoid cavity of the shoulder-blade and running through the shoulder-joint, the other arising from the so-called coracoid process of the same bone. They soon unite to form an elongated muscle which occupies the front of the arm ending just below the elbow. Its tendon is inserted into the outer bone of the fore-arm, but it joins the fibrous covering of the muscles below the elbow. It should be noticed that the muscle runs from the shoulder-blade to the fore-arm, having no connection with the upper arm. It is a good example, being a comparatively simple muscle, one very wide-spread among vertebrates and one very subject to variations in man. We shall follow our author through at least several of these. 1st. The cleft usually confined to the beginning of the muscle is complete, cutting it into two lying side by side. This is explained as perfectly natural, because in many animals each part is a complete muscle and either may exist alone, though in primates they are fused together. Both of them are present in the crocodile. 2d. The glenoid half is wanting. We are told that this is normal in the rhinoceros, the pig, the ostrich, the frog, and other animals. But what has this to do with man? No one ever claimed that he descended from either of these animals. 3d. The coracoid portion is wanting. This is said to be merely a reproduction of the type of many species of several orders, as the paca, the hedgehog, the beaver, two species of monkeys, many carnivora, as the hyena, the dog, the cat, the seal, the bear (not always), and others. Dr. Testut, however, omits to mention that, common as this arrangement is among animals, it is very rare in man. 4th. There is an extra head from the coracoid. Our author is struck by the resemblance to the *ornithorhynchus*, and alludes to more or less marked tendencies towards reduplication of the muscle in some saurians, chameleons, and birds. 5th. By far the most common anomaly in

man is the occurrence of one or more extra heads from the bone of the upper arm or from neighboring muscles, but this is by no means common in animals. It is found in the rhinoceros, in some bats, occasionally in the ourang, and in some other cases. It would be too great a trial of the reader's patience to go through all the variations of this muscle. Neither is it necessary, for we have already seen that in man it occasionally resembles a vast number of the most diverse animals. Were we to continue we should have to add to the list the chimpanzee, the dromedary, the giant kangaroo, and turtles; and all this from the study of a single muscle. There is, however, one more set of variations in this muscle that deserves mention from its bearing on the theory of the repetition in the embryo of alleged ancestral peculiarities. In some animals, the horse, for instance, the long head of the biceps does not run through the shoulder-joint, but along the outside of its capsule, projecting into the joint, but not running through its cavity like a detached cord, as in man. It has been shown that in the early stages of the shoulder-joint in man, and in animals having the same arrangement, the tendon is at first attached to the capsule and gradually frees itself to gain its position in the joint. This is quoted as a transitory appearance of a lower type, but it is probable that the resemblance is purely accidental. It is not easy to see how the tendon could be developed in the middle of the joint. It is, if not necessary, at least much more natural that it should separate itself from the capsule. Pursuing this train of thought, we find that there is often great difficulty in deciding whether a given anomaly is really a representation of an animal structure or not. Happily it is not necessary to decide in every case; for, though there may be many on debatable ground, there are many also that are clearly of one class or the other.

How are these facts to be accounted for? Is it true that heredity is the necessary explanation? It appears so at first sight, but with a little study the supposed necessity fades away. All are familiar with instances of the inheritance of some defect or peculiarity, usually the reverse of desirable, which reappears in families often after the lapse of one or two generations. How natural it seems to account for anomalies in the same way. If, indeed, these anomalies were always, as they sometimes are, in the line of supposed descent of the body, their significance as an argument in its favor would be very great; but it is lost by the irregularity of their appearance. It has been shown above how one anomaly is traced to the camel, another to the rhinoceros, another to the bat, another to birds, and some even to turtles and amphibians. As the distinguished Professor Gegenbauer has intimated in a review of Testut's book, it is hardly satisfactory, in view of these facts, to read on the title page:

"Anomalies Musculaires *expliquées* par l'Anatomie comparée." The explanation needs explaining. No one maintains that man descends from a turtle or a bird or a camel, but at most that there is some cousinship, say a few millions times removed. Surely if man's body were derived from some lower animal, either we should expect to find the hereditary characteristics, both the constant and the occasional, pointing so clearly in a given direction as to be unmistakable; or else we should have to hold that they have no bearing on the question. Further, if structures appearing in widely separated classes are inherited from a common ancestor, either he must have been a very polyglot having the most diverse and highly specialized organs fully developed, which is absurd, or he must have had them potentially, of which there is no evidence. A great difficulty which the followers of Darwin's theory pure and simple, which is not to be confounded with evolution as a whole, have had to contend with, is the appearance of similar organs in such widely separated parts of the animal kingdom that it is impossible to account for them by gradual modifications. Professor Mivart¹ points out that "the conception of an innate force similarly directed in each case, and assisted by favorable external conditions," removes the difficulty. But if the difficulty is insuperable, according to the original theory, in the case of constant structure, how much more so in that of those of rare occurrence. The attempt to explain these things by heredity is a failure.

III.

Still there must be an explanation both of the occurrence of variation and of its reproducing peculiarities of other and often distant species. Let us take the latter part of the question first. Probably the cause is to be sought in symmetry, in homology, in short, in the archetype. We now enter a higher sphere than that of physical observation. There is a general plan of a vertebrate animal implying a certain symmetry and certain main features, but susceptible of modification in detail. Where is this archetypal idea? It cannot be in the mind of the observer, for it is an objective or ontological, not a logical idea. It cannot be in the animals themselves, for, apart from the pantheism in such a suggestion, the idea is antecedent to its expression. It can be only in God. Evidently, then, it is beyond our grasp, but of its existence we can be certain. To those educated in agnostic schools such a doctrine sounds unscientific. Dr. Conn² in his recent summary of evolution

¹ The Genesis of Species.

² Evolution of To-day, by H. W. Conn, Ph.D., Instructor of Biology at Wesleyan University. New York & London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1886. This is a popular statement of the various theories and in many respects a very creditable work. The

speaks of the theory of types "as not open to investigation since it lies beyond the realm of human knowledge," and again he alludes to it as a supernatural rather than a natural explanation. Knowing as we do that the existence of God is within the scope of human reason, we need no extended argument to prove that in the great act of creation He is not without a purpose. He has certain ideas in the sense expounded by St. Thomas.¹ Nothing more is needed to establish the doctrine of types. Dr. Conn finds a difficulty in our ignorance of the number of types and in the fact that what he takes to be types apparently run into one another. Here the difficulty truly enough is in the inadequacy of human reason, which from its very nature cannot know all that is in the Divine Mind; but we can know the grand fact without knowing the details. For example, we know that God created heaven and earth but we do not know to what extent He made use of what we call evolution, and our ignorance of this in no way impairs our knowledge of the fact of creation. Dr. Conn recognizes the possibility of a combination of the theory of types with evolution, but he seems to be haunted by a fear from which he cannot escape that a so-called supernatural explanation is not "scientific."

Although, as has been said, the archetypal idea is in God, its effect is in the creatures themselves, much as the law of attraction is in matter. It determines the action of their substantial forms. All vertebrate species having a common plan, it is not in the least more wonderful that a variation should occur through homology than through heredity. Nay, if the variation be one that by the latter theory could come only from an ancestor who existed, if at all, ages ago, the former is infinitely more probable. To explain a bird-like peculiarity in man by heredity is absurd, by homology is not. True, we cannot tell by what mechanism it acts, neither can we tell how heredity acts in those cases in which its influence is undoubted. If to defend a theory it were necessary to demonstrate the details of its *modus operandi*, what would become of physical science?

The doctrine of types is particularly offensive to ultra-evolutionists, because it necessitates the recognition both of a Creator and of a God-given tendency in the created. It contradicts flatly the teaching, so dear to certain minds, that organized beings with man at their head started from low beginnings and, without definite tendency, somehow blundered into their present perfection.

We have now to meet the question whether the occurrence of anomalies is consistent with the view of the immediate creation of

author evidently endeavors to be fair and shows no signs of anti-religious bias, but he is influenced and his intelligence hampered by agnostic ideas.

¹ Summa, Pl. Quæst. XV., Art. 2.

man's body, and of the stability of species. Showing, as these phenomena do, an undoubted tendency to variation, at first it seems that there is a contradiction, but it is very doubtful whether they can be quoted on either side. It is no new observation that nature presents a series of gradations ; it is no new statement that man is an animal distinguished from other animals only by his soul. True, the soul, his substantial form, removes him, as Professor Mivart has remarked, further from the nearest brute than that brute is from a stone ; none the less his body has the structure of an animal and the lower part of his nature is animal. Why, then, should not man's body, as well as other animals' bodies, be liable to vary ? Why it should vary can be only guessed at, probably it is in consequence of an imperfection of animal (and vegetable) nature. But, be that as it may, the point of our contention is, that the assumption that anomalies of structure give evidence of descent, is entirely unjustified ; and that if every animal had been created precisely as it is, still their common nature might, under certain (quite unknown) conditions, permit variations within certain limits defined by the laws of symmetry and homology. We have no desire to discuss the origin of man's body, and would not be understood to be arguing against the possibility of its derivation from an animal, which, it seems to us, may, in the want of a decision from Rome, be held as an hypothesis, provided always that reasonable probability should be discovered in its favor.

EDUCATION IN LOUISIANA IN FRENCH COLONIAL DAYS.

I.

LAST winter the Louisiana Education Society asked for original essays on educational matters, wishing to obtain "the most practical thought and careful thinking in this line."

The desire to receive practical information on this vitally important subject is a hopeful sign. For as soon as people say there is no more for them to learn, progress is at an end; or should any avenues of progress remain open to them, it will be of that species which a humorous native of a certain island, not unknown in song and story, graphically described as "progress to the rear."

Ignorance has been called the foundation of knowledge. An ignorant man has one advantage over an ill-educated man: he has nothing to unlearn. In a similar sense repentance may be the foundation of virtue; there is hope for the evil-doer who admits he has done wrong; while little good is expected of one who argues himself into the belief that wrong is right, and that there is nothing in him susceptible of improvement.

A philosopher of the Middle Ages reproached a conceited brother of the same craft with being unable to say "*nescio*." The reproach of St. Bernard to Abelard can scarcely be made to the above body, for if its members had seen no room for improvement in the methods employed with their sanction, they would not have sought to obtain "more practical thought in this line."

But none of our contemporary educators appear to have sought any light on early education in Louisiana. Perhaps they deem history a blank as to its educational aspect in Colonial and early American times. The itinerant lecturer, like the schoolmaster, has been "abroad" during the pleasant winters of Louisiana, and the business of this functionary seems to be to tell the rising generation that, despite the statemanship, military renown, and philanthropy of the past, the light that was in these regions was darkness. Why? Because there were no godless schools. The South was slow to introduce a system which came when Colonial days were over, and which experience has proved to be subversive of religion and morality, as indeed its originators intended it should be. (See Brownson's "Convert," chapters 7 and 8.)

We will endeavor to show some deeds of our predecessors "in this line," which perhaps may awaken in a few a desire to know more

of what was undertaken in the distant past, in the face of tremendous obstacles, that in this respect a tardy justice may be done to the "brave days of old." And some who imagine that nothing which *they* cannot remember was ever done for popular education in this State, may be glad to have brought under their notice the earliest efforts made to educate the youth of "*Notre Chère Louisiane*."

To elucidate this theme thoroughly, it would be well to give a synopsis of the history of Louisiana, the dynasties that took, but would not keep, for their crowns so fair a jewel, the men of renown who sojourned within her borders, the feats of arms done in her defence by loyal citizens and reclaimed privateers, the Indian wars raging almost without truce, the foreign and civil wars, the stock-jobbing of Law, who was to create wealth, so to say, by the wand of a magician. These remarkable men, and deeds of valor, and banking bubbles, had their influence on education, and it would be a pleasing task to trace it in its various phases through administrative, municipal, religious, and domestic life. But all this will appear sufficiently for our purpose in the tenor of these pages.

II.

La Salle reached the Mississippi on April 6th, 1682. On the 9th, he baptized the country which he had explored by the sweet-sounding name *Louisiana*, and his chaplain, in presence of twenty-three French, eighteen Abnaki, ten Indian women, and three children, blessed *Louisiana* and dedicated it to God amid the roaring of cannon, the singing of hymns, and the recital of appropriate prayers. Five years later, La Salle was assassinated. Nothing was done to colonize the immense territory of which he had been viceroy. His grand discovery was almost forgotten, and the Father of Waters disappeared from the navigators' charts. When another famous mariner, Iberville, entered the great river by the gulf, March 2d, 1699, not a hut was to be seen. Sea-marsh and virgin forests greeted his eyes; but, as time wore on, mementos of the earlier sailors appeared. A letter, or *speaking bark*, from Tonti, and a breviary in which was written the name of a companion of La Salle, were given to Iberville by an Indian, and Tonti himself came, like a ghost from the past, to tell the mighty deeds of his brave but unfortunate master to the mariners now following up his discoveries.

Chevalier Tonti, La Salle's trusted friend, was known as "the Man of the Copper Hand." The loss of a hand in the wars in Sicily he had repaired by one made of copper.

The premature death of Sauvolle in Biloxi, and of Iberville in the West Indies, left the sole care of Louisiana to their brother Bien-ville, who became the founder of New Orleans and Mobile.

When Bienville, with unerring sagacity, selected on a bend of the great river the best site for a commercial emporium, he set fifty men (1718) to clear the soil of its rank vegetation and build huts of moss and wattles, roofed with bark and palmetto. In 1722, just as the capital had been transferred to *Nouvelle-Orleans* from the lonely beach of Biloxi, there were one hundred cabins scattered over the highest patches of the morass, and Charlevoix, who visited the embryo city, was touched by the spiritual destitution of the white settlers and the Indians whose camp-fires lit up the river-banks and sparkled in the dense forests beyond the flimsy palisade. There was no need of schools. Few children, if any, had come to bless the dismal kraal in which the keen-eyed Charlevoix saw the nucleus of a populous and opulent city. In 1723 the Bishop of Quebec sent Franciscans to the white settlers, and in 1724 Jesuits came to evangelize the Indians. By 1726 many women had joined their husbands, and children were frolicking in the jungle and staring with terror in their wide eyes at the alligators that wriggled in the moat and the frogs that croaked forever in the slime. At that early date the sagacious Bienville was devising ways and means to furnish the Colony with good schools. He was too acute not to perceive that families would not establish permanent homes in the Colony unless educational facilities were provided for their children. A boys' school arose at once beside the warehouse that did duty for a church, and the first teacher that ever instructed the youth of Louisiana was Father Cecil, a Capuchin monk.

So far as I can learn, no picture or memorial of this pioneer of literary and scientific education exists in any college of Louisiana. In the university endowed by Mr. Tulane I saw pictures of several persons supposed to be connected with education in this State, but not one of them wore the friar's frock. And none of the wandering lecturers who so frequently come to enlighten Louisiana on her history and educational progress has begun at the beginning and told his audience of Father Cecil. And yet in giving a history of what rivermen call steamboating, any lecturer would tell of Robert Fulton, and search into his parentage, rightly believing that those who gave him being were glorified by his genius. They might say, like one¹ of his biographers, that, though born of Irish parents, "his remote ancestors were probably of Scottish origin." Had the educationalists heard of Father Cecil, they might deem it "probable" that his "remote ancestors" were of New England, and himself a priest like Wyclif. But that they completely ignore Father Cecil, shows that they have never heard of him.

Bienville, anxious to root families to the soil, and knowing that

¹ Mr. Rennick, who perhaps did not know that the remote Scotch were all Irish.

civilization depends largely on the careful training of girls, took extraordinary pains to secure capable teachers; and, as the best were to be found in convents,—religious being then the only persons who adopted teaching as a life profession,—he turned to his native Canada for *Sœurs Grises*. But to his great grief, his project proved impracticable. He consulted Father Beaubois, Superior of the Jesuits, a man of great zeal and energy. Their views were identical, and Beaubois offered to apply to the Ursulines of Rouen. After much negotiation, a treaty was concluded, September 13th, 1726, by which these ladies engaged to supply teachers and nurses for New Orleans. It was, then, through the Jesuits that the first school for girls and the first regular hospital were established in the Louisiana of La Salle, which extended from the Great Lakes to the Mexican Gulf, and from the Alleghanies to the Rocky Mountains.

A lady bearing the somewhat singular name of Tranchepain (*slice of bread*) was appointed Superior. Mother Tranchepain, a convert from Calvinism, had taken the veil among the Ursulines in Rouen, in 1699. The contradictions, disappointments, and trials that wait upon all great enterprises were not wanting to this. Bishops who at first approved of their design, afterwards refused to allow nuns of their respective dioceses to leave, and some were obliged to appeal to Cardinal Fleury.¹ Louis XV., of whom so little good can be said, was a generous patron of this work, as the *brève* or official letter setting forth its objects and conditions testifies. Here is an extract:

"His Majesty, wishing to favor everything that can contribute to the relief of the sick and the education of the young, has approved the treaty made between the Company of the Indies and the Ursuline Religious, the intention of His Majesty being that they should enjoy, without interference, all that has been or shall be granted to them by the said Company. His Majesty takes them under his protection and safeguard, and in proof of his good will has commanded the hastening of the present Letters Patent, which he has willed to sign with his own hand.—Fontainebleau, September 18th, 1726."

All the nuns for the Louisiana mission assembled in the monastery of Hennebon, in Brittany, to acknowledge as Superior Marie Tranchepain of St. Augustin, January 1st, 1727. Their action was confirmed by two letters from the Bishop of Quebec, Monseigneur Delacroix, one to Mother Tranchepain, the other to Father Beaubois. Louisiana was in his diocese, Quebec being under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Rouen. The missionary

¹ Almost all the Ursulines in France were volunteers in the good cause, and those obliged to remain at home had a holy envy of those selected for this perilous mission.

nuns were twelve. They gave their submission according to their respective ranks, eager to sacrifice themselves for the glory of God and the salvation of their fellow creatures, and filled with a holy enthusiasm which helped them in their sublime vocation. Two, at least, the Mother Superior and the novice, Madeleine Hachard, of Rouen, have left in their "Relations" evidence not only of sincere devotion to God and ardent zeal for souls, which they possessed in common with the rest, but also of liberal scholarship, fine culture, and unusual intellectual ability.

The terms offered by the Indian Company under whose auspices they were to sail, evince great interest in the sick and the children. They travelled at the expense of the Company, and each received, before embarking, a gift of 500 livres. Until their plantation should be in full cultivation, each was guaranteed 600 livres a year. A fine convent in course of erection was given them in perpetuity. Three nuns were to be always at the service of the hospital; one was set aside for the free school, and one to help her in case of overwork. It was expressly stipulated that those in charge of the sick and the free schools must not be disturbed. This shows that New Orleans was scarcely founded when provision of the most liberal and excellent description was made for the education of the "masses." Should the nuns, through want of health, or any other cause, wish to return to France, they were free to go at the expense of the Company. But not one looked back after having put her hand to the plough.

III.

On the 27th of January, 1727, the nuns looked their last on Paris, whence they journeyed to L'Orient, delayed by execrable road and bad weather, but bright and cheerful under all contrarieties. On February 22d, a day since memorable in the history of the United States, they bade adieu to their country, "for the glory of God and the salvation of the poor savages." They sailed in the *Gironde* with the Jesuit Fathers, Tartarin and Doutreleau, and "Frère Crucy," who, with Madeleine Hachard, being the youngest of the party, considered it "their duty to amuse the rest." No words of ours can describe, nor would it be easy to imagine in these days of rapid travel, Pullman boudoirs and ocean palaces, the sufferings of those "who went down to the sea in ships" a hundred and sixty years ago. The voyage had its chroniclers; every incident is vividly described in the letters and diaries of Mother Tranchepain and Sister Hachard, which have most unaccountably escaped the researches of the historians and romancists of Louisiana. These ladies, first teachers of Louisiana, wrote with ease and elegance, and a grace and liveliness which the lecturers who expatiate so perseveringly on the benighted times of old could not, we fear, equal.

It would take too long to give details of this seven months' journey from Paris to New Orleans, over the stormy Atlantic, among the West Indian Isles, on the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico, and up the Mississippi.¹ Now they were threatened with a watery grave, again with starvation and thirst; once the ship barely escaped hostile corsairs, later they encountered savages of so peculiarly ferocious a type that they murdered by slow tortures all the whites they captured, and made every victim drink his own blood.

Probably no scene on earth is so bleak and dreary as the entrance from the Gulf to the Mississippi. An interminable waste of waters, a vast morass impassable for man or beast, shoals and sand bars, low strips of coast covered with poplars, prairies of reeds, a wilderness of cane-brakes—the mouths of the river were then strewn with driftwood and half choked with wrecks. As they ascended, forests that seemed coëval with the creation; here and there a solitary hut for pilots, stretches of green savannah, gaunt trunks of trees stuck fast in the sand, snags, to-day the *crux* of the river-man, gigantic cyprus shrouded in funereal moss, half submerged in the yellow waves. Gloom and magnificence everywhere mingled; fishes disporting themselves ruffled the old-gold surface of the melancholy river; blue cranes like flying skeletons hovered about the masts; swarthy, half nude natives in pirogues and chaloupes glided among the wondrous waves, shimmering in the mystic charm of the summer sunlight. But dreadful was the navigation of the lower Mississippi in those days. "The trials and fatigues of our five months' sea voyage," writes one novice, "are not to be compared with what we had to endure in our journey from the Gulf to New Orleans, a distance of thirty leagues."

As the Sisters neared their future home, the flat monotony of the landscape was agreeably diversified by masses of dark foliage, sparkling at night with fire-flies, which made a gorgeous illumination. Planters' houses squatting among the half cleared areas—huge, unwieldy structures, wide halls dividing their whole length,—the river beating against the edge of the miry ground and threatening to submerge it; right joyfully were the travellers welcomed by the *habitans*, "honest people from France or Canada, who will send us their children." "They are enthusiastic over our arrival, because they will not now be obliged to go to France to educate their daughters."

The nuns reached New Orleans on August 7th, 1727. An early writer has described the village as a vast sink or sewer. It was surrounded by a deep ditch, and fenced with sharp stakes, wedged

¹ The Spanish annals add to the trials of their voyage the cruelty of the Captain, but no mention is made of this in the letters of Madeleine Hachard.

closely together. Tall reeds and coarse grasses grew in the streets, and a stone's throw from the rickety church reptiles hissed, and wild beasts and malefactors lurked, protected by impenetrable jungle. One novice gives a flattering description of the town: "It is very handsome, well-built and regularly laid out. . . . The streets are wide and straight; the houses wainscoted and latticed, the roofs supported by white-washed pillars and covered with shingles, that is, thin boards cut to resemble slates and imitating them to perfection. . . . The colonists sing that our town is as beautiful as Paris. But I find a difference. The songs may persuade those who have never seen the capital of France. But I have seen it, and they fail to persuade me."

The tropical gorgeousness of the vegetation charmed her. The country, save for a small space about the church, was thickly wooded to the water's edge, and the trees were of prodigious height. The streets and squares, laid out by the engineer, La Tour, were still mostly on paper only. The air was on fire with mosquitoes, every one provided with a sting like a fine, red hot nail. Yet she found the climate balmy and soothing, and readily believed the boast of the Creoles that it was the most salubrious on earth. She remarks that those who had given the nuns a poor idea of the place had not seen its progress for several years. The tremendous hurricane of 1723 had swept away the cabins in which the earliest settlers had found a miserable shelter. And the town was rebuilt on a scale of modest splendor which surprised and delighted the nuns.

Mother Tranchepain dilates on her joy and consolation on touching the soil of New Orleans: "We set out for Father Beaubois' house, and met him coming towards us, leaning on a staff, because of his weakness. He looked pale and weary, but on seeing us brightened up"—he was recovering from a dangerous illness. A crayon sketch, kindly lent the writer by the amiable successor of Mother Tranchepain, gives a lively representation of the "Landing of the Ursulines." The nuns are in procession, wearing the ample garb of their Order. Sister Hachard's fine, strong lineaments are partially concealed by the flowing white veil of a novice. F. Beaubois presents them to the Capuchin pastors of the town, and points out the Indians and negroes, their future charges. A negress holding a solemn ebony baby regards the group with awe and wonderment. A beautiful squaw, decked with beads and shells, surrounded by plump papooses, half reclines with natural grace on some logs, and a very large Congo negro has dropped his work and betaken himself to the top of a woodpile to gaze leisurely on the scene. Claude Massy, an Ursuline postulant, carries a cat which she tenderly caresses; another, "Sister Anne," is searching a basket for

something. Both wear the high peaked Normandy cap. Franciscans heavily bearded, and Jesuits in large cloaks, appear in the distance. Immense trees, which have long since disappeared, overshadow the whole group. The picture is a most interesting and valuable relic, probably the only one in existence which shows *tout ensemble* the first schoolmasters and schoolmistresses of any country, and its earliest preachers of the Gospel of Peace.

The nuns breakfasted with F. Beaubois. Governor Perier, Madame Perier, and all the chief people welcomed them as risen from the dead, for they had been given up as lost. Bienville's country house, the best in the colony, given them provisionally, was a two story edifice with a flat roof, used as a belvedere or gallery, situated on Bienville street, which runs perpendicularly to the river, between Royal and Chartres streets, which are parallel to it. Six doors gave ingress and egress to the apartments on the ground floor. Large and numerous windows, with sashes covered with fine linen, let in as much light as glass. The garden opened on Bienville street. From the roof the nuns might gaze on a scene of weird and solemn splendor. Swamps and clumps of palmetto and tangled vines; the surrounding wilderness with groups of spreading live oaks (*chênières*), cut up by glassy bayous, was the home of reptiles, wild beasts, vultures, herons, and many wondrous specimens of the *fauna* of Louisiana. Here were flocks of the pelican, fabled to feed its young from its bosom, and chosen as a symbol of the teeming soil of Louisiana as it had been chosen from earlier times as a beautiful type of Jesus, *pius pelicanus*, who feeds His children with His own Sacred Body and Blood. Our novice makes the immense trees, which surround the garden, responsible for the terrible atoms she calls *frappes d'abord*, "which sting without mercy and threaten to assassinate us." They came at sunset and, after preying on the nuns all night, returned to the woods at sunrise.

The holy sacrifice of the Mass was offered for the first time in the temporary convent, August 9th, 1727, by F. Beaubois, who acted as chaplain to the little community. In accordance with their earnest desire, he placed the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle which their deft fingers had lovingly prepared, October 5th. They were the only consecrated virgins in the vast region now known as the United States, and it would not be easy to imagine their emotion when, bowed down before the Awful Presence, they offered reparation to the Sacred Heart of Jesus for the indifference or sinfulness of the multitude, and besought the Fountain of all mercies to bestow the gift of Faith on the savages they had come so far to reclaim.

This, then, was the first girls' school established in Louisiana.

It was but a few squares from the venerable hovel on the south of the church, where Father Cecil taught the boys of the town. As to air, light, spaciousness, and picturesqueness, there is not a finer site in Louisiana to-day. It was established primarily as a free school. The receiving of the rich as boarders was an after-thought. "When the Religious find it convenient," says a contemporary document, "they may take paying pupils, if they judge proper." But it was expressly stipulated that the nuns in charge of the free schools and the sick "should not be put to teach in the pension school." So that the free school, instead of being the outgrowth of a new idea due to our northern friends, is contemporaneous with the colonization of Louisiana.

The Sisters at once began to teach the children and extend their cares to the sick, the Indians and the blacks. Sister Hachard praises the docility of the children, "who can be moulded as one pleases." She says it is easy to instruct the negroes once they learn French, but "impossible to baptize the Indians without trembling, on account of their natural propensity to evil, particularly the squaws who, under an air of modesty, hide the passions of beasts." The Religious were valued throughout the colony as the most precious gift the mother country could bestow. They were loaded with presents. Governor Perier and his amiable wife often visited them. The Intendant, Delachaise, who "commanded for the king in the absence of the governor," is described as a perfect gentleman "who refuses nothing we ask of him." "The marks of protection we receive from the highest in the land cause us to be respected by the whole population. This, 'continues our acute novice,' would not last long if we did not sustain by our actions the exalted opinion they have of us."

IV.

The community which thus auspiciously began the work of education in Louisiana consisted of eight professed members,¹ one novice, and two candidates. "Never," says our novice, "was any other community so well accommodated in the beginning of its existence." The house soon became too small for the number of pupils, ever increasing. A solid brick convent of ample dimensions was in course of construction at the other extremity of the town. The Indian Company promised to have it ready in six months, which space lengthened out to seven years. The gentlemen who had begun with so much diligence grew weary of well-doing.

¹ 1, Mother M. Augustine Tranchepain; 2, Sisters Marguérite Judde; 3, Marianne Boulanger; 4, Madeleine de Mahieu; 5, Renée Singuel; 6, Marguerite de Talaon; 7, Cecilia Cavelier; 8, Marianne Dain; 9, Madeliene Hachard; Claude Massy, and a candidate styled simply Sister Anne.

Neither tears nor solicitations could prevail on them to supply material and finish the work. The nuns grew disheartened. They had no pecuniary means to forward it, and it was with difficulty they contrived to live in a new country where the prices of provisions were enormous. "God, whose designs are impenetrable," writes the annalist, "permitted that several who had worked hardest in this enterprise should die before the accomplishment of their desires." A most efficient member, Sister Madeleine de Mahieu, died July 6th, 1728; Mother Margeurite Judde followed, August 14th, 1731, and Sister Marguerite Talaon, September 5th, 1733. On November 11th, 1733, the brave and gentle Superior, Mother Augustine Tranchepain, "submitted to the same penalty, and like another Moses, expired in sight of the promised land." However ardent her desires of seeing the accomplishment of a work which she had so happily begun, she met death with edifying firmness, and was in a manner angry with those who showed some expectation of her recovery.

Not a stone upon a stone remains of the dwellings consecrated by the joys and sorrows of that heroic band, exiles for Christ. Bienville's villa, Father Cecil's venerable school-house, the church, the monk's convent and library, the arsenal and town-hall, perished in the dreadful conflagration of Good Friday, 1788, which swept away nearly nine hundred houses, leaving thousands homeless. Tradition asserts that the nuns lived some time on their plantation, and points out *Nun* street, a short street flanked with cotton presses and opening on the *Levéé*, as the site of their country house. The nomenclature of the streets that form a net-work over what is supposed to have been the Ursuline plantation recalls the holy souls who prayed and taught within its limits, *Religious St.*, *Notre Dame St.*, *Annunciation St.*, *Teresa St.*, etc.

The hospital of the Sisters usually had from thirty to forty patients, mostly soldiers. And everything was so well arranged that the officials said it was useless for them to continue their visits—there was nothing for them to do. At first the infirmarian watched the nurses, but ere long she took sole charge. The sick could not say enough in praise of their "mothers," who would even gratify their tastes when it could be done without prejudice to their health. "We bless God for the success of this Christian work," writes the chronicler, "The spirit of our holy institute shows itself in the good our Sisters do for souls while attending to the wants of the body." Like all nuns who serve the sick, they were consoled by many wonderful conversions.

It was on a fair summer evening, the air cool and balmy after days of incessant rain, that the nuns took possession of their new convent, July 13th, 1734, the first built on the delta of the Missis-

issippi, and the oldest in the United States by some seventy years. Great progress had been made in the education of the young at this early epoch. Improvements had been introduced everywhere. In the culture of fruits and vegetables, immense advances had been made; figs, grapes, pine-apples, melons, oranges, sweet and sour, beans, potatoes, were quite common. The Jesuits cultivated many rare varieties, and their gardens, hedged with wax myrtle, now the site of the richest quarter in New Orleans, were the wonder and delight of the colony. Madeleine Hachard speaks of the immense quantities of fruit sent to the convent, which the nuns, aided by their pupils, made into jellies and preserves. As early as April 24th, 1728, she tells her father, at Rouen, that Father Beau-bois' garden, the finest in the town, is full of orange trees. During Holy Week, the nuns and their pupils gave evidence of progress in music: "We had exhortations attended by nearly two hundred persons. The *Tenebræ* and the *Miserere* were sung; at Easter we had the whole Mass set to music, with quartettes admirably executed. The convents in France, with all their brilliancy, seldom do as much." The nuns had twenty boarders, three parlor-boarders, three orphans, and seven slave-boarders, "whom we instruct and prepare for Baptism and First Communion," a large number of day scholars, besides "many black and Indian women, *who attend our school every day for two hours.*" It was usual for girls to marry at thirteen or fourteen, but henceforth no girl was allowed to marry without first being instructed by the nuns.

They received under their protection the orphans of the Frenchmen recently massacred at Natchez, and some *Filles à la cassette* (girls with a trunk or casket), sent hither by the king as wives for respectable colonists and soldiers. These poor girls had scarcely tasted their hospitality when they were claimed by men in need of helpmates. The marriages made on so short an acquaintance usually turned out well. Even girls from French Houses of Correction became excellent wives and mothers, perhaps because they were instructed by the Sisters previous to receiving the seventh sacrament. F. Beaubois expected that the Ursulines would establish religion throughout the colony by their good example and instructions. The Acadians also enjoyed their hospitality, but this was later.

Their removal to their new monastery was the occasion of one of the most elegant pageants ever devised in the city of pageants, one which shows conclusively that the Louisianians had taken, as it were naturally, such culture as the Ursulines were able to give. To-day, after all that has been said about the decoration in art and the æsthetic everywhere, we doubt if anything more chaste, yet stirring and showy, could be devised, great though our resources be.

From July 2d, the nuns had been looking in vain for favorable weather. A down-pour, lasting three days, began on the 9th, flooding gardens and making roads impassable. On Saturday, 13th, just as they had resolved to postpone their departure indefinitely, the sun burst from the cloudy heavens, and in his brilliant light and tropical heat the waters soon subsided. The sudden clearing of the sky they took as a good omen, and at 5 P.M. all their bells rang out to announce their intended departure. Bienville, whose third term (1733-1743) had recently begun, soon appeared in the convent chapel, where the nuns knelt for the last time. Fathers Beaubois and Petit, and Brother Parisel, Jesuits; Fathers Philip and Pierre, Capuchins, and the most distinguished people of the place surrounded the brilliantly lighted altar, and the troops, half French, half Swiss, drew up on either side of the old convent.¹

V.

Father Philip gave benediction, assisted by Fathers Beaubois and Petit. All left the chapel processionally, the citizens opening the march. Then came the children of the orphanage and the day-school, followed by forty of the principal ladies of the city, bearing torches; next twenty young girls robed and veiled in the purest white, and twelve others, representing St. Ursula and her 11,000 companions. The boarders, orphans, and day pupils carried wax tapers. The young lady who personated St. Ursula wore a costly robe and a regal mantle of tissue of silver. Her crown glittered with pearls and diamonds, and a veil of the richest lace fell about her in graceful folds. She bore in her hand a heart pierced with arrows made with wondrous skill. Fair children arrayed as angels surrounded her, and all waved palm branches emblematic of the glorious victory won by the heroic virgin-martyrs whom they had the honor to represent.

Lastly came the Religious with lighted candles, and the clergy carrying a rich canopy, under which the Most Blessed Sacrament was borne in triumph. Bienville and his staff, the Intendant, Mons. Salmon, and the whole population formed their escort. The soldiers moved in single file on each side, about four feet from the procession. Hymns were sung by all, the accompaniment of fifes and drums making pleasing harmony; Brother Parisel, in surplice, acted as master of ceremonies, and perfect order and decorum prevailed. This moving panorama of light, color, and beauty halted between the church and the *Place d'Armes*, and defiled gracefully into the aisles, the troops kneeling and presenting arms to do honor

¹ From the old convent, the villa of Bienville, to the new, the distance is less than a mile, along Chartres street. The southern part of Chartres street, on which the new monastery, now a very old one, is situated, was then Condé street.

to the Blessed Sacrament. The nuns knelt within the sanctuary. Father Philip placed the *Veiled Saviour* on the altar, and the clergy knelt in lowly adoration. Soldiers robed as acolytes were swinging censers whose delicate perfumes filled the church. The congregation remained prostrate till Father Petit, S. J., the orator of the occasion, arose to address them. In a sermon described as most eloquent by the nun whose facile pen has embalmed these precious details, he set forth the necessity and advantages of giving young persons a solid Christian education. In glowing words he congratulated the nuns on their labors to this great end, so conducive to the glory of God and the welfare of the Colony. At the close of this touching address, the soldiers sang hymns to the Blessed Sacrament and St. Ursula. They then fell down before their hidden Lord with such demonstrations of reverence that a spectator, not given to mild views, feared their interior dispositions did not correspond with all this exterior respect.

The torches and tapers were not superfluous when the procession wound out of the church; the sun was setting, but the after glow remained for a while, burnishing the lofty trees and turning the mighty river into molten gold. It drew up before the *Place d'Armes*,¹ and the bells of the new monastery rang out their merriest peals as it moved slowly in the deepening twilight, not ceasing till all had entered the sacred edifice, a few squares distant. "Thus did we enter our new abode," writes the chronicler, "amid the chiming of bells, the music of fifes and drums, and the singing of praise and thanksgiving to our heavenly Father whose loving Providence has lavished on us so many favors." Benediction was given a third time. As it was late and "insufferably warm," the *Te Deum* was deferred to the next day, Sunday. "The people withdrew, apparently pleased and edified, and we were delighted to find ourselves once more secluded from the world and all it loves and esteems."

The first day our good Religious spent in their new home, the Blessed Sacrament was exposed and a solemn *Te Deum* was sung. In the evening there was benediction and "we sang a mottet that won the admiration of the distinguished people who assisted at these ceremonies. We were really charmed with our new house," continued our anonymous chronicler; "much is yet to be done, but the joy of being separated from the world outweighs all inconveniences." Father Dagobert, who came to New Orleans in 1723, lived to witness a more stirring and pompous procession. Thirty-five years later, August 18th, 1769, he watched the superb battalions and *fusileros* of Don Alexandro O'Reilly crossing the *plaza*

¹ *Place d'Armes*, a field before the church, called in Spanish colonial times the *plaza*, now Jackson Square.

to the military mass and *Te Deum* which were to celebrate the transfer of Louisiana to Spain. The hoarse roaring of cannon mingled with the mellow tones of all the bells in the town as they rang out a joyous welcome to the hero of the day. O'Reilly, who worthily represented the potent majesty of Spain, attended by a staff of gorgeously accoutred men, preceded by officers bearing massive silver maces, moved forward to the music of hundreds of instruments. When they halted to be officially welcomed by the representatives of the Church, the prolonged shouts which rent the air, *Viva el Rey*, were heard in the cloisters of St. Ursula. The Friar received His Excellency at the church-door, welcomed him with every demonstration of respect, and with utmost enthusiasm promised fidelity to the crown of Spain for his brethren and the people. He then blessed the Spanish colors which ascended the flag-staff when the white banner was lowered. When that redoubtable chieftain bent his pale intellectual countenance radiant with devotion, and knelt with forehead to the earth at the *Te ergo quaesumus*, perhaps he thought no scene could be grander or more thrilling than that of which he formed the central figure. Or, it may be, that, like another warrior of the same race, his triumphs had a tinge of bitterness because they were not for the land of his birth and his love. But I fancy Father Dagobert's mind reverted to the procession of 1734, and that, however thrilled and overawed by the warlike grandees of Spain and the princely Irishman who commanded them, his heart preferred the earlier and lovelier pageant.

The whole scene of July 13th, 1734, intensely dramatic as it was, passes before our mind's eye in its quaint and gorgeous beauty. Civilians in the graceful costume of that era, officials in their showy robes of office, matrons in grand toilettes of the rich gold-striped stuffs that surprised Madeleine Hachard on her first introduction to the women of the Colony—soldiers in gaudy uniforms, veterans wearing medals of gallantry won on many a field in Europe; dignitaries with black servants in bright liveries; Bienville attended by a splendid staff; children in purest white strewing flowers before the Blessed Sacrament; young girls richly appareled, "St. Ursula" in sparkling diadem and royal robes waving the graceful palmetto of the country. Dark-robed nuns, in flowing veils and mantles, led by Sister Hachard, whose clever pen has left such vivid pictures of early colonial days—acolytes in bright cassocks and snow-white surplices, swinging silver thuribles—bearded Franciscans in the brown habits of their Order, Jesuits in simple soutanes, the officiating clergy in glittering vestments—the rich canopy borne aloft, soldiers in Indian file, keeping step as a guard of honor, between whose lines passed the hidden God. The rich sonorous

voices of the men, the clear, sweet treble of the women and children, the martial music of the soldiery; the eager-eyed blacks and the swarthy Indians who see in this old-world grandeur a picture of heaven, and the warm beams of the sun gilding the whole; the giant trees whose branches bend low as if in adoration of the *Veiled Presence* beneath the canopy, the red sunbeams glittering through the foliage and forming halos over St. Ursula and her Virgin Companions; the cardinal birds like tufts of fire in the trees, the mocking birds making sweet melody in their hiding places; the clouds of incense ascending heavenward—all this must have equalled in beauty and variety any other religious display ever devised, and speaks volumes for the culture of Louisiana in French Colonial days.

VI.

The Ursulines seem to have been particularly successful in developing and cultivating the musical tastes of their pupils. The women, the children, and the soldiers could, as we have seen, unite with the clergy and the sisters in singing and moving forward to the accompaniment of military music; and it is always trying to sing while marching, however slowly. It would be interesting to see the scores from which they sang and to which they marched. Perhaps they lie unnoticed in some secret drawer of the Ursuline library. This display shows that congregational singing is not an innovation in New Orleans; it evidently entered largely into the worship of the early settlers.

The nuns were able to afford increased educational facilities to their pupils in their new home. The good wrought by them increased every day, and parents were influenced through their pupils. The blacks, then very few, and the Indians who came and went at will, were tenderly cherished. Mother Melotte, who succeeded Mother Tranchepain, was a woman of great energy and did much to improve and beautify the monastery, and fit it for its many purposes. Laundry, store-room, bakery, a small parlor, and a room for the *tourrière*, still standing, were added in quick succession. The day scholars increasing, new school-rooms followed. The convent was built to stand sieges—attacks from the Indians or the English were almost always expected. And as it was incongruous that such a structure should be surrounded by a fence of stakes, the good Mother, at a cost of 6000 francs, built a brick wall around the whole enclosure, part of which still stands. All this was done at the expense of the nuns, who were surprised that the sum charged to the building accounts, 100,000 francs, did not supply all the offices and include a hospital. Those who know the old monastery will be interested to hear that the ground-floor had a small

chapel, two parlors, a room for the Mother Superior, refectories for the sisters and the boarders, community rooms, kitchen, scullery, and pantry. On the next floor, first in English, second in French, were dormitory, infirmary, sacristy, linen room, wardrobe. The orphans occupied part of the upper story; the rest was used as an instruction room for the colored women. "We succeeded in persuading the gentlemen of the Indian Company," writes one of the nuns, "to erect a separate building for the sick." To this the patients were removed, August 20th, 1734. It was behind the convent, facing Arsenal street, which immediately changed its name to Hospital street. The first infirmarian, Sister M. Xavier, before assuming the charge, wished to see how the lay nurses managed the sick. "But her apprenticeship was short, for charity compelled her to take sole charge of them." Heretofore, only patients in danger of death had been received, but the new building was spacious enough to accommodate all the sick. Such were the humble beginnings of the splendid Charity Hospital, which is not the least of the glories of New Orleans.

VII.

The educational advantages given by the Ursulines to girls of every class may perhaps be the cause why the Creole women of Louisiana have been regarded by many as morally, religiously, and even intellectually superior to the Creole men. But it was not Bienville's fault that there was no high school or university for boys. Rich parents sent their sons to Europe, and the benefits of such a course were not always commensurate with its risks and expenses. The truly enlightened founder of the city sought the best teachers for the boys, as he had done for the girls. He wrote to the French Government, in 1742:

"It is long since the inhabitants of Louisiana made representations on the necessity of having a college for the education of their sons. Convinced of the advantages of such an institution, they wished the Jesuits to undertake its creation and management. It is essential that there be one at least for the study of classics, geometry, geography, pilotage, etc. It is too evidently demonstrated to parents how utterly worthless children turn out who are reared in idleness and luxury, and how ruinously expensive it is to send children to France to be educated. Moreover, it is to be feared that Creoles educated abroad will imbibe a dislike to their native country and come back only to receive and convert into cash the property left by their parents."

The Intendant Salmon made this petition jointly with the Governor, but it was set aside as premature. Bienville left the Colony for France on May 10th, 1743, never to return. As he had always

labored for the profit of Louisiana, it may well be believed that he used his influence in Paris to advance the project he had so much at heart. But the times were unfavorable, and every year increased the difficulties of its execution.

The sun of St. Ignatius was already beginning to set. The suppression of his children throughout the French dominions loomed up in the distance, and years of anxiety and persecution were preparing minds for that final issue. So far from being able to found another establishment in New Orleans, they were soon to be driven from a Colony in which they had labored with signal success from its earliest days. The Jesuit College, for which Governor Bienville asked, was not founded till late in the next century. The formal order for the suppression of the Jesuits was issued by the French Government in 1764, and their brethren in Spain and Naples shared the same fate. The plantation which their labors had wrung from marsh and swamp and changed into a garden of Eden was confiscated by an ungrateful government to which their property in Louisiana brought 180,000 dollars, an enormous sum for the time. They had introduced sugar-cane, which later became a fruitful source¹ of wealth to Louisiana, "the sugar-bowl of the United States." By the lamentable exodus of so many zealous priests, the nuns lost their directors and best friends, and education in Louisiana its most influential and cultured patrons. Madeleine Hachard was spared this great sorrow. She died in 1762, after having faithfully taught the youth of the Colony for thirty-five years. The letters of this accomplished woman show her to have been full of high and generous sentiments, and ardently devoted to her holy vocation.

The administration of the generous and hospitable successor of Bienville, the Marquis de Vaudreuil, the Grand Marquis, as he was styled, was a period of unusual brilliancy, 1743-1753, though not without its disturbances. He was succeeded by Kerlerec, a captain in the French Navy. D'Abbadie, who followed, died in office in 1765. This year was signalized by the arrival of 650 Acadians who, after being hospitably received in New Orleans, were sent to Opelousas and Attakapas, where their descendants remain to this day. By a secret Treaty of Cession, Louisiana was given over to Spain on February 10th, 1762. But Aubry, the last French governor, remained in the colony till he delivered it officially to O'Reilly, in 1769.

The despatches of the later French governors and other officials

¹ In 1882 the Louisiana sugar-crop netted 340,000,000 pounds. In that year 70,000,000 pounds were lost by the overflow of the Mississippi. The largest recorded sugar crop before the war was (in 1858) 500,000,000 pounds, and 30,000,000 gallons of molasses.

prove the colony to have been in a desperate condition. De Bas-sac tells the home government that "drunkenness,¹ brawls, and duels destroyed half the population." And D'Abbadie complains that the "facility offered by the country to live on its natural productions has created habits of laziness," that the "whole population is stupefied by the vice of drunkenness," and that "Louisiana is a chaos of iniquity and disorder." Kerlerec, from his cell in the Bastile, "from the bottom of his heart pities" the Spanish Governor, Ulloa, for being sent to such a country. All this had a baleful influence on education. Those devoted to education, above all others, require peace of mind if they would make their work a success. The Ursuline Religious were always treated with great deference in the old colonial days. But it was difficult for teachers or pupils to attend well to school duties while the city Fathers were holding conventions, sending out deputations, and heading the armed squads that paraded the streets. Spain, having already too many colonies, was slow to take possession of the gift thrust upon her by the degenerate Louis XV., through his infidel minister, Choiseul, who had already lost Canada to France. The most excited condition of public feeling prevailed. Official reports state that anarchy was becoming almost universal. The people besought the king not to separate them from France. The aged Bienville made the same petition with tears, and, it is said, died of grief when Choiseul refused to grant it. The disturbances of the quasi-interregnum affected the cause of education most unfavorably. From 1760 to 1770 was a period of bitter agitation and controversy. The antecedents and consequents of the transfer to Spain disturbed the country socially and religiously as well as politically, and nowhere was the change more keenly felt than within the walls of the Ursuline convent. The nuns, mostly French by birth and attached to their country and her language, were given to understand that Spanish was to be henceforth the chief language of their schools. The Spanish domination² brought them Spanish subjects for whom they seem to have had about as much welcome as the French Friars for their Spanish brethren. Even the Indians complained of being "handed from one white chief to another like so many head of cattle."

Difficulties between clergy of different orders, and between French and Spanish clergy of the same order, and later, between clergy and their bishops, had a deleterious effect on education. The

¹ The drunkenness resulted from the immoderate use of *tafa*, a kind of bad whisky made from the sugar-cane.

² Four Spanish ladies from Havana took the veil in the Ursuline Convent, New Orleans, 1772. A church was built for the nuns at the expense of the King of Spain about the same time.

first Spanish governor, Don Antonio Ulloa, a scholar of European reputation, would doubtless have done much for education, had the people allowed him. But they arose in arms against him, and forced him to leave the country. "It is well known," wrote the Spanish minister, Grimaldi, regarding Ulloa's expulsion, "that the loss of great interest is looked upon in Spain with indifference, but not so as regards insults or contumelies." Charles III. decided to punish the insult offered to the Spanish crown, and enforce his authority. On August 18th, 1769, Don Alexandro O'Reilly, an officer of the highest rank in the armies of Spain, honored with the royal friendship and confidence, appeared before the town with twenty-four sail, and 2600 picked men, the flower of the Spanish troops. The mere sight of this armament, or rather the news of its approach, quelled the insurrection. Twelve ring-leaders were tried for high treason and found guilty. Their defence was that Ulloa, whom they had driven out, had not shown his credentials; that they had not taken the oath of allegiance, and that Spain had not formally taken possession. But it was proved that the Spanish flag had for years been floating at every post from the Balize to Illinois; that some of the accused had held their commissions from the king of Spain, and drew salaries from him while exciting revolt against him. Six were sentenced to death, one of whom died in prison, and six were banished.

Though O'Reilly¹ has been blamed by a few for suffering the law to take its course, yet, at the time, he was judged extremely merciful. His powers were absolute; yet only a few of the leaders were punished, and a full, unconditional pardon was granted to the rest, *i.e.*, almost all the men in the colony. "I have the honor," wrote Aubry to the French Prime Minister, "of sending a list of the small number whom the General (O'Reilly) was indispensably obliged to have arrested. This proves his generosity and kindness of heart, considering there are many others whose criminal conduct would have justified their being treated in the same manner." Elsewhere he expresses astonishment that "the mere presence of one individual should have restored good order and tranquillity." And the Council of the Indies unanimously declared that "all the official acts of Count O'Reilly merited their most decided approbation, and were striking proofs of his extraordinary genius." With great liberality and profound policy, O'Reilly placed men of French birth or descent in all the chief offices of the State,² and sustained the French clergy in their charges.

¹ France gave Louisiana to Spain lest the English should seize it. Had an English governor come under the same circumstances as O'Reilly, what a butchery there would have been of the insurrectionists!

² A course diametrically opposite has always been pursued by the English in Ireland. Hence, while the Louisianians became thoroughly reconciled to the Spanish Domina-

It was at 3 P.M. on October 25th, 1769, that the five men who were to die were brought to the place of execution. Their sentence was read to them in Spanish, and repeated in French by John Kelly and John Garic, who had acted as interpreters at the trial. The firing of a platoon of grenadiers, distinctly heard by the terror-stricken Ursulines, ended their lives in a moment. It is a great pity that so humane a ruler as O'Reilly should have felt himself unable to restore order and at the same time spare the lives of these men to whom the law had decreed death. The widow¹ of the condemned who died in prison, Villeré, was the grand-daughter of Delachaise, the early benefactor of the nuns. When peace was restored, education flourished once more. O'Reilly soon brought order out of chaos. His romantic story and his wise and vigorous administration place him high among the small number born to rule. A ripe scholar, versed in the literature of many nations, he warmly patronised the existing schools, especially those of the Ursulines. New schools were established and some of the most learned professors of the universities of Spain came to New Orleans to preside over them. O'Reilly, who could have travelled from his native Meath to Moscow without an interpreter, pleased the people by addressing them in French, though he preferred the stately Castilian, which he spoke and wrote with classic purity of diction.² The officers associated with him in the government were all scholars of distinction, Gayarré, Navarro, and Loyola. The last claimed kindred with St. Ignatius, and was, like him, a model of knightly courtesy, a poet, and a valiant soldier of the cross. Don Joseph Loyola died in New Orleans in 1770.

Perhaps in succoring the Ursulines, to whom he was a generous benefactor, the poetic mind of O'Reilly and his truly Catholic heart wandered to a beauteous green isle, framed in sea-foam and draped with clouds, in which the song of cloistered virgins then seemed hushed forever. His entrance into New Orleans was a poem in itself, which must have recalled to his Celtic imagination the bare-armed Feni, the Ossianic heroes who haunt the shadowy past, and his ancestors in pre-historic Erin—dark-haired warriors wielding ponderous battle-axes, and white robed bards harping

tion, which was really a despotism very mildly administered, and for years after the American ascendancy would gladly have brought back the golden days of Spanish colonial rule, the Irish have never been satisfied with the English Government.

¹ Madame Villeré's brother, M. Delachaise, and the chief Creoles and Frenchmen of the colony immediately took office under O'Reilly, which would seem to show that they regarded the execution of the convicted men as a regrettable act of justice, and that O'Reilly's instructions from the king left him no choice in the matter. When O'Reilly wished to raise in the colony "The Regiment of Louisiana," the number of applicants exceeded the number to which he limited this corps.

² Hon. Charles Gayarré, great-grandson of O'Reilly's *contador*, showed the writer several autograph letters of this celebrated Irishman.

upon their harps of burnished gold. For this princely ruler was almost the last high priest of vanishing chivalry. In the oath of office he administered to his subordinates is a promise to defend the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady, and never to take any fee from the poor.¹

Although the wants of the Ursulines were fully supplied, the king of Spain, perhaps on the representation of His Excellency Governor O'Reilly, insisted on paying the convent a pension for the support of two of the nuns, probably those who taught the free school. Meanwhile the English language, universal in Louisiana to-day, was slowly creeping in; it was largely spoken in Mobile, Pensacola, and Baton Rouge. From the earliest days the English had traded with the settlers on both sides of the river. They kept up the slave trade, and supplied planters with Africans of every tribe. Bienville himself had met them in the Mississippi when the village of Tchoutchouma occupied the site of New Orleans, and they were among the earliest pale faces the red men saw. Aubry, the last French governor, corresponded in English with the governors of other provinces. In 1769 O'Reilly wrote: "I drove off all the English traders and other individuals of that nation, whom I found in the town (New Orleans), and I shall admit none of their vessels." But despite the Spanish ascendancy and the gradual introduction of English, French continued to be the favorite language of the Ursuline nuns, and was taught to all their pupils, even after the city became *Nueva-Orleans*.

It does not fall within the scope of this article to follow the early teachers of Louisiana through the old Spanish colonial times or the first years of American domination. We will, therefore, conclude with a glance at the FIRST GIRLS' SCHOOL erected in Louisiana, still, battered and decayed as it is, one of the largest and strongest houses in the State. The devouring tooth of time has eaten into the blue-gray stucco which once covered its massive walls, but not a vestige of its old aspect has departed. Dozens of windows with small panes of greenish glass look out on its cool gardens. A queer shrine flanks the end of the centre walk. A patch of sugar cane, a few flowers that seem to have been blooming since the last century, and some antiquated fruit trees, bring the past vividly before the spectator. Once this garden stretched to the Mississippi, but now huge rows of ugly houses shut out the river view. Tradition points out where the nuns were buried; but all were removed

¹ Here is another of O'Reilly's regulations: "The governor with the Alcaldes, the Alguazil Mayor, and the *escribano*, shall yearly on the eves of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday, make a general visitation of the prisons. . . . They shall release those who have been arrested for criminal causes of small importance, or for debts, when such debtors are known to be insolvent, or shall allow them a sufficient term for the payment of their creditors."

to the new monastery grounds in 1824. The colored servants who were interred in the front of the convent were never disturbed. One would not like to eat the fruit of these gardens. For students have told their friends in mysterious whispers of a nun who sleeps beneath a certain cherry tree—she would not leave her ancient haunts; and of a supernatural spectre, “a ghost all in white” who roams about the grassy walks, and wails in the gloomy corridors, on certain high festivals. Nor would it surprise one who rambles through this old place to meet some spirit-nun on the broad, creaking staircase, with the thin iron balustrades, or in the large deserted rooms that once resounded with sweet children’s voices, and the hymns that charmed the simple Creoles of old colonial days.

We ascended the top story, once used as an instruction room for blacks. Imagination peoples it in a moment. There is the desk at which sat the brave and gentle teachers who had crossed the seas to bring these poor creatures to God. Dusky maidens and matrons come hither in crowds for advice, instruction, and consolation; their faces tell their tribes—the comely Yolloff, the treacherous Congo, the fierce Mandingo, the quarrelsome Banbarra, the intelligent Foulah,—all wearing the picturesque turbans of their full dress. And hither, too, crowd the Indian women, with a world of sorrow in their long, dark eyes. We descend; look through the various offices and people them with the gentle Sisters we know so well. We gaze on the clumsy gate with its small *grille* and quaint iron knocker, and think of some who passed through these faded portals. The early Jesuits and Franciscans, old Father Bienville, honest Perier and his pious wife. See how they crowd up from the dreamy past, not shadowy creatures from the twilight regions of romance, but beings real and human. The grand Marquis de Vandreuil in gilded casque and heron plume, the pensive *Filles-à-la-cassette*, the weeping Acadians, the chivalrous descendant of MacCarthy More, the scholarly Ulloa—the austere countenance of the princely O’Reilly, the dashing Galvez, the lordly O’Farrell, the intellectual face and piercing black eyes of Peñalvert,—that group of princes in the centre of which is the pear-shaped head¹ of Louis Philippe—the spare physiognomy of Andrew Jackson, lean and haggard from midnight vigils, but illumined and glorified by his eagle eye—how they all crowd upon the memory in this hallowed spot, so full of holy and historic associations. The prelates of New Orleans, except Bishop Peñalvert, have always been guests of the Ursulines, who have given them free use of this ancient mansion. But we, for one, could not carry inside these old walls the habits and sentiments of the last quarter of the nineteenth

¹ The future King of the French and his two brothers were in New Orleans in 1798.

century. The energy necessary to live and go forward to-day would ooze out through our finger-tips. We should be forever wandering in the shadowy past, dreaming dreams and seeing visions. The spirits conjured up by imagination would be more pleasant to us than the stern realities of every day life. Years would seem but as days when spent in sweet dalliance with many a fair wraith ascending from the old graves under the quivering trees, eluding our grasp and melting, in the calm sweet hours of even, into the dreamy moonlight. And, verily, to a poetic temperament, loving to revel in historic lore, the spectre-nun of the past wailing in the forsaken halls of the ancient monastery, yea, even the "ghost all in white," rising from her green couch under the cherry tree, would be a more pleasing companion than the tiresome votary of fashion, or the soulless worshipper of wealth, in which our age is so fertile.

THE SPIRITUAL IDEA IN DANTE'S *DIVINA COMMEDIA*.

I.

A STUDY of the *Divina Commedia*, in any of its aspects, must needs be a study of the age in which it was produced, of the man out of the fulness of whose soul it issued in notes strong and clear, and of the various influences that made their impress upon both the man and the poem. Of all the supreme efforts of creative genius, the *Divina Commedia* is that that can least be taken out of the times and circumstances that gave it birth. Its contemporary history and its contemporary spirit constitute its clearest and best commentary. In the light of this commentary we shall attempt to read its chief meaning and significance. Few poems admit of so many instructive interpretations; few so profitably repay earnest study. I take it, as a primary law of criticism, that if we can pluck from the heart of the poem its central conception and vivifying principle, we will not only grasp its meaning in the main, but we will also throw light upon many a dark corner within its structure. And in working along the line of its Spiritual Sense, will we be most likely to grasp that conception and verify that principle. Unfortunately, commentators have so buried the

beauty and meaning of the poem beneath the rubbish of conjecture and far-fetched interpretation, that its unity of plan and purpose has in great measure been lost sight of, and its true grandeur but rarely appreciated. In the present paper we first address ourselves to the man and his times; afterwards we consider the poem in its general spirit and bearing as the outcome of the times and the man; and finally, we endeavor to determine the philosophy and doctrine that are the foundation of its Spiritual Sense, and the nature, action, and outcome of that Sense.

II.

Dante was born in 1265; he died in 1326. Glance at what had been done before, and what was being done within, the compass of those years. Already the piety, zeal, and indomitable spirit of Innocent III. (Pope, 1198-1216) had caused the Papacy to be respected throughout Christendom and raised it to a high pinnacle of glory and prestige. It became the controlling power in Europe. St. Louis had led the final Crusade and died in a stranger's land (1270). The last faint echoes of the trumpet-voice that nigh two centuries before had aroused nations and hurled army after army upon the shores of Asia were now dying away within Dante's own hearing. The poet was born into stirring times. Feuds and factions were rife. They were handed down from sire to son and brought in their trail ruin, bloodshed, and desolation. City stood against city, province against province; and both city and province, town, hamlet and even house, were torn by internal dissensions. No man could escape being embroiled. No man could hold his head up and walk securely, a man among his fellow men, who did not share the responsibilities of his party, and carry out the vindictiveness of the house with which he was connected. Men were Blacks or Whites; they were Guelf or Ghibelline; they were Cerchi or Donati; they accordingly fought and suffered. This fact made the *Divina Commedia* possible; it gave it some of its color and helped to fashion it into its present shape. It brought Dante exile, poverty, suffering; it hardened him against his enemies; it inspired the gall and bitterness; but it also gave him the leisure to meditate and construct his great poem.¹

The age of Dante was preëminently a Catholic age. It was an age when men lived in one faith, had one ritual, recited one creed, were taught one and the same doctrine and practice, and breathed a common religious atmosphere. The Church extended the mantle of her care and charity over all orders of society and gave sanction

¹ "I went about," he tells us, "almost a beggar, showing against my will the wound of fortune, the blame of which frequently and unjustly is wont to be imputed to the person stricken."—Convito. Tratt i., cap. 3.

and benediction to institutions founded to meet the spiritual and corporal wants of Christ's poor. Dissenting sects and schools such as the Albigenses and Waldenses in France, the Cathari, Paterini, and disciples of Dolcino¹ in Italy, cropped out here and there, but they were the exception. The only recognized form of religion in every nation—that indeed upon which every Christian state in great measure was built—was the Catholic religion. Religion was the supreme affair with the men and women of that day. The world beyond the grave was to them an ever-present reality. Their thoughts and fancies dwelt in it. Their belief in it was intense. They, so to speak, touched it with their hands. It was a powerful factor in their lives. They might be guilty of great excesses—indeed theirs was an age of excesses—but sooner or later remorse overtook them and their atonement was as generous as their sins were enormous.² Religion was abused, but none the less manifest were its beneficial effects; vice was flagrant, but it never lost the sense of shame; men were cruel, but their cruelty was followed by sincere regrets; misfortunes were frequent and signal, but they were accepted with resignation or with the hope of retrieval, or men gloried in them on account of the cause in which they suffered. "Religion," says Tommaseo, "was not separated from morality, nor science from life, nor were words from deeds."³ Such was life at that day; such do we find it exemplified in the person of the poet and embodied in his poem.

This religious spirit inspired the chivalry of the day. Knights passed from land to land in search of adventure, vowed to protect and defend the widow and the orphan and the lonely or oppressed woman at the hazard of their lives; they went about with a prayer on their lips and in their heart the image of the lady-love whom they had chosen to serve and to whom they had pledged loyalty and fidelity; they strove to be chaste in body and soul, and as a tower of strength for the protection of this spirit of chastity they were taught to venerate the Blessed Mother of God and cultivate towards her a tender devotion as the purest and holiest ideal of womanhood. This spirit of chivalry is the ruling spirit of Dante's life and the inspiration of some of his sublimest flights. As the knight wore the color of the lady of his heart and proclaimed her transcendent qualities to all comers, even so did Dante, in the same spirit, proclaim the beauty and loveliness and virtue of his Beatrice beyond all compare.

¹ Inferno, xxviii., 55. Villani, viii., 14.

² Guido da Montefeltro after a life of violence becomes a Franciscan Friar. See L'Inferno, xxvii., 67-129.

³ La Divina Commedia, Commentata da Niccolo Tommaseo. L'Inferno, Art. II secolo di Dante, p. xx.

This religious spirit inspired men and women to go on long and wearisome pilgrimages. Every shrine of prayer had its votaries. With staff and scrip, and in all humility and earnestness; in a prayerful spirit, in penance for sin, for the healing of soul or body, with the view of obtaining through the intercession of a favorite saint some special grace, they walked to the place of pilgrimage and there in vigils and fastings besought heaven in their behalf. The practices and expressions of pilgrimages became part of men's thinking. They entered into the language of spiritual life. Life itself came to be regarded as a pilgrimage to the heavenly Jerusalem. And in this allegory do we find the key to one meaning running through the *Divina Commedia*.

This religious spirit gave direction to the studies of the day. It was the inspiration of the teachers of the age. It caused to bud and bloom the great thoughts of the great thinkers of this great epoch. Pope and king vie with each other in founding universities and schools.¹ It is an age of inquiry and disputation; but over all preside faith and piety. The schools are filled to overflowing. The great philosophic lights, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura, both die in the eventful ninth year of Dante's life (1274). Albertus Magnus dies when Dante is in his fifteenth year (1280); Roger Bacon, when the poet is in his twenty-ninth year. These men represent all that was grandest, noblest, and best in the thought of the schools. Contemporary with our poet were lesser lights, but none the less great thinkers and instigators to thought: Raymond Lully (1244-1305), Duns Scotus (1274-1308), Ockham (d. 1345). The light of these men set Christendom aglow. Thought was quickened. The very atmosphere vibrated with Scholastic disputations. It was the golden era of Scholasticism. Dante made careful study of the writings of these great thinkers. Some of them he may have heard discourse and expound; for he attended the Schools and entered into the discussions that were then considered so essential an element of study and criterion of proficiency. We learn from Boccaccio how strong in the poet was the spirit of study: "In his eagerness to know, he heeded neither heat nor cold, nor vigils, nor fasts, nor any other bodily inconvenience." He retained that spirit, with few intermissions, through life. The writings of his contemporaries and their instructors—especially those of Aquinas and Bonaventura—became his daily food, and they are the basis

¹ In Dante's own day we see Boniface VIII. establish the University known as the Sapienza. We may, in justice to a much-maligned man, and as an antidote to the bitterness of Dante's verses against him, quote the following tribute: "Religion owes to him the consoling institution of the Jubilee; ecclesiastical jurisprudence, the sixth book of the Decretals; and general science, the foundation of the Roman university known as the Sapienza." Darras's *History of the Church*, vol. iii., p. 456. See Darras's larger work continued by L'Abbé J. Bareille, t. xxx. pp. 18-124.

of his great poem.¹ Nor did he forget Plato and Aristotle so far as they were known and understood in his day. The Stagyrte he calls the master of those who know, and next him in the philosophic family he places Socrates and Plato.² Much there was in the discussions of this period that was purely curious, silly, of small edification and of no profit; much also was there that we of the present may study with advantage; much indeed must there have been that was noble and suggestive, since it was the epoch that built the Gothic Cathedral, dictated the *Summa Theologica*, and inspired the *Divina Commedia*.

III.

Thus it was that over all presided Religion. Religion was the Time-spirit of that age. It permeated thought and word and work. This fact we must bring home to ourselves if we would understand the scope of the great poem under consideration. A word upon the evolution of this spirit may not be out of place. Pagan Rome attained her rounded civilization by reason of the fact that all the elements in the State, whether literary, or political, or religious, or social, or industrial, or artistic, were bound up in harmony, and were subservient to the one, universal, all-absorbing idea of Rome. Everything in life and conduct, in religion and morals, was sacrificed to the will, the safety and the glory of Rome. Then came Christianity. It entered as a disturbing element. It brought not peace and concord, but discord and the sword. It undid the harmony existing between the State, religion and human passion. It taught men to make war upon their unruly passions, and upon the corpse of slain evil inclinations, to walk in the road of self-denial to a higher spiritual life undreamed of in the religion of pagan Rome. That God was more than man, the soul more than the

¹ The depth and accuracy of Dante's theological knowledge is something marvellous. The terseness and grasp with which he handles the most abstruse subjects has never been excelled, and has never ceased to elicit the admiration of competent judges. Epitaphs are not always correct; but ages of study and investigation have confirmed that upon the poet's tomb at Ravenna; all are agreed that Dante is not only the glory of the Muses and the popular favorite, but also the theologian lacking naught in doctrine and philosophy:

"Theologus Dantes, nullius dogmatis expers,
Quod faveat claro philosophia sinu;
Gloria Musarum, vulgo gratissimus auctor,
Hic jacet, et fama pulsat utrumque polum. . . ."

² Vidi 'l Maestro di color che sanno,
Seder tra filosofica famiglia.
Tutti l'ammiran, tutti honor gli fanno,
Quivi vid 'io e Socrate e Platone,
Che 'nnanzi agli altri piu presso gli stanno.

Inferno, iv., 131-135.

body, eternity more than time ; that the practice of virtue is noble and self-indulgence base ; that spending and being spent for the good of one's neighbor was laying up treasures in heaven ; that to live in Christ and die for Christ was gain ; that the love of God and man was the supreme law of life ; such were the seeds of doctrine sown broadcast throughout the Roman State, and nurtured by the blood of millions of martyrs. The barbarian came and conquered pagan Rome, to be conquered in turn by the Christianity he found there. And this Christianity sought him in his native wilds and took possession of him. For centuries the fierce spirit of the barbarian struggled against the checks placed upon his untutored nature. Indeed he has never been wholly overcome. We all of us carry within our breasts the savage spirit, and it only requires the occasion to arouse its ferocity.

Still, in the age of Dante, in spite of great excesses, man had come to recognize the existence of a spiritual life and a spiritual world, and to bow in submission to an authority speaking to him in the name of the higher spiritual power. He had come to regard the Church as the medium through which God reveals His will to men. And so, at this epoch, we find the secular and religious elements of society more harmoniously blended than they were before or have been since. This blending is strikingly reflected in that one great poem that is the full and clear expression of all Mediæval thought and Mediæval life.¹ Herein enters an element that is absent from pagan literature. It is the element of spiritual life and spiritual thought. It speaks of the predominance of Faith Faith tinged word and work and made both word and work sincere, earnest, and, says Ruskin, "in a degree few of us can now conceive, joyful."² Men lived in hope, sought the light and looked toward the light. Everywhere they found reflections of the Light that enlighteneth this world. In this respect there is a marked contrast between the Time-spirit of that day and the Time-spirit of the present. The great chorus of modern thought is a loud proclaiming of pessimism and the despair that would destroy a hereafter, annihilate the soul and ignore a Personal Divinity. It acts in open defiance of the whole Christian codes of spiritual truth

¹ That there was in Dante's spirit a leaven of the old Roman spirit determining his judgments of things in antagonism with the spirit of Christianity, is apparent from these two instances : 1. He condemns Pope Celestine V. for resigning from the Papacy. Now it is certainly a meritorious act to withdraw from any position the duties of which one is unable to fulfil ; and that the Church so regarded this act of Celestine is evident from the fact that she canonized the good Pope. 2. The Church condemns suicide as an act of moral cowardice ; and yet Dante places the keeping of Purgatory in the care of Cato of Utica, because he renounced life rather than liberty. It is to the point as an allegory, but the spirit of pagan Rome all unconsciously breathes through the admiration of the poet for the old Roman.

² Pleasures of England, p. 57.

and spiritual law that are essential elements in all modern conduct and modern thinking, and that lurk in the very conceptions and arguments of those who would be rid of them. "Its crowning dogma," says a recent writer, "is written even now between the lines in many a dainty volume, that evil has a secret holiness, and sin a consecrating magnificence."¹

Now, of this spirit must we divest ourselves in entering upon a study of Dante's masterpiece. There we will find no doubt. All is intense earnestness. The light of Faith guides the poet's steps through the hopeless chambers of Hell with a firmness of conviction that knows no wavering; it bears him through the sufferings of Purgatory, believing strongly in its reality; it raises him on the wings of love and contemplation into Heaven's empyrean, where he really hopes to enjoy bliss far beyond aught he sings. If we would understand the animating principle of the poem, it behooves us to cast aside all idea that these divisions of it were a mere barbarous and cumbersome machinery. Not in this fashion are epoch-making works constructed. Dante believed in the existence of these places and in the reality of their woes and their joys as firmly as he held his own. The simple faith pervading this poem contrasts strikingly with the spirit animating *Faust*. The latter is designed to represent the innate conflict of the savage in man against established law and order in the moral, social and physical world. Mephistopheles is the evil genius of the hero. He impersonates the negation of truth and goodness. But much as the spirit-world figures in Goethe's masterpiece, it does so not as a living reality, but as a mere scaffolding whereby Goethe builds up the artistic structure of the experiences gathered from study and observation, or found in the recesses of his own large worldly heart. And what is the uppermost lesson that one may read on every page of that wonderful panorama of modern life? As we understand it we read simply the dark lesson, that only through the experiences that come of all manner of self-indulgence and self-gratification may one reach the broader view of life and attain perfection. This is making one's own way out of the wood of error and wrong-doing at the risk of being devoured by the beasts of predominant sin and passion. The hero is guilty of crime the most atrocious; he brings ruin in his wake; up to his last hour he is sensual and covetous; he deserts not his sins; rather his sins desert him. There are regrets; in one instance there is remorse; but there is no conversion. And yet, as though in mockery of the Christian ideal of personal purity and holiness, this sinful soul is triumphantly borne to heaven amid the song of Angels. He is saved by the only saving princi-

¹ Rev. William Barry, in *The Fortnightly Review*, March, 1886, Article, "The Church and the World."

ple on, or above, or under the earth—the principle of Love: "Whoever striving exerts himself, him can we redeem, and if he also participates in the love from on high, the Blessed Host will meet him with heartiest welcome."¹ Here as in Dante the hero is the special object of womanly love. She whose heart he broke pleads in his behalf before the Mater Gloriosa, and her prayer is heard. But surely the perfection of heaven is not the satiety of self-gratification. The will must be turned towards the good. It has been truly said "that not until the Ethiopian changes his skin and the leopard his spots, can he do good that is accustomed to do evil."² And this has been still more forcibly emphasized by St. Paul: "And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it availeth nothing."³ Now, where in the heart of Faust is that charity that St. Paul insists upon? What charity did he extend toward his neighbor except in so far as it gratified himself and was in accordance with his conception of things? He seeks regeneration, not in repentance, but in oblivion and communion with Nature. *Faust* is a poem of selfishness. Beatrice, after upbraiding Dante for his sins, says: "God's high destiny would be broken if Lethe were passed and such food were tasted without the repentance that breaks forth in tears."⁴ Such is the womanly love in Dante's conception: spiritual, elevating, ennobling, strengthening, ideal. These characteristics we fail to see in Goethe's conception. But *Faust* is the world-poem of this century, even as the *Divina Commedia* is of the thirteenth. Goethe is the mouthpiece of the modern world; the Middle Ages sing through Dante. And as each was a child of his age, the personality of each is a determining element written into the fibre of both great poems.

IV.

Dante, as revealed to us by time and his writings, stands out in bold relief as a man proud, fiery, irascible, the bitterness of exile and poverty corroding his soul and dropping gall from his pen, and withal humble and gentle and tender;⁵ a man strong to hate and strong to love—

Dowered with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn,
The love of love—

¹ *Faust*, Part II., Act V. Chorus of Angels bearing the soul of Faust.

² A Study of Dante. Susan Blow, p. 39.

³ I. Corinthians, chap. xiii., 3.

⁴ Purgatorio, xxx., 142-145.

⁵ Witness the tenderness with which the poet always speaks of the relations of mother and child (*Inferno*, xxiii., 38-42).

a man sincere in all he says and does, truth-loving and truth-telling, sparing no one, neither himself nor his friends, nor his enemies. His was a varied career. He imbibed at his mother's breast the traditionary feuds and traditionary hates of his family; he nurtured them and fought for them. He was acquainted with the ease and comfort of wealth; he tasted the pleasure of having had honors thrust upon him; he was wise in council and prudent in diplomacy; he felt the shock of battle and witnessed the carnage of war. He travelled from land to land studying men and things, his keen eye penetrating beneath the surface, finding naught too small to be unworthy of note, naught too grand for his expansive intellect to compass. He strayed from the paths of virtue and drank the cup of vice to its nauseous dregs,¹ and in his own soul he experienced the hell of remorse. He repented, gave himself to prayer and meditation, and even in all probability to the austerities of religious life;² he relapsed, recovered himself again,³ and died an edifying death, clad in the habit of St. Francis.⁴ He was exiled; he wandered from place to place, an outcast upon the earth, tasting the insipidity of another's salt and the weariness of going up and down another's stairs;⁵ yearning to return to his beloved Florence, which he loved with all the love of a son for a mother; always yearning, but never returning, and hating his enemies all the more fiercely for keeping him out. How insatiable was his thirst for knowledge through all his troubles we have already seen. There was no subject taught that he did not master: medicine, law, letters, music, mathematics, painting, physics, philosophy, and with great breadth and depth, his favorite, theology. He absorbed in all of these whatever was worth knowing. In some subjects he even went beyond his teachers and anticipated modern theories.⁶

Such is the man as we see him walk among men: silent, reserved, haughty, taking no liberties and allowing none to be taken. Can Grande wonder why the poet with all his learning cannot amuse half as well as his buffoon. And Dante retorts with all the scorn of his soul that he supposes it to be because like is pleased with like.⁷ Not after this fashion does he seek amusement.

¹ Purgatorio, xxx., xxxi. Paradiso, xv., 121-123. Par., xxiii., 121-123.

² Balbo, Vita. Lib. I., Cap. vii., pp. 94-98. The poet's familiarity with spiritual life could not have been well acquired outside of a noviciate.

³ Paradiso, xxii., 107-108.

⁴ Balbo, Vita. Lib. II., Cap. xvi., p. 422. Pelli, p. 144.

⁵ Paradiso, xvii., 55-66.

⁶ Il notar solamenti i luoghi degli scritti danteschi, e segnatamente del poema, in cui l'autore fa prova di singolar virtù filosofica e anticipa talvolta i pensieri e i trovati più recenti, vorrebbe un lungo discorso. Chi crederebbe, per esempio, che Dante abbia divinato il sistema dinamico? Gioberti. Del Bello, Cap. x., p. 238. See Opere. Ed. Lombardi vol. v. p. 89. See also Tiraboschi. Vita. in Opere., vol. v.

⁷ Similis simili gaudet. Hettinger, Die Göttliche Komödie, p. 55.

Not every man is a companion for him; and so we find him restless and wandering, writing his soul into his great poem.¹ That is a characteristic picture left of him by the prior of a monastery which he visited: "Dante has been here," writes Brother Hilary; "as neither I nor any of the Brothers recognized him, I asked him what he wished. He made no answer, but gazed silently upon the columns and galleries of the cloister. Again I asked him what he wished and whom he sought; and slowly turning his head, and looking around upon the Brothers and me, he answered, 'Peace!'"² Brother Hilary takes him apart and speaks a kind word to him, and the reticence and reserve melt away, and beneath the haughty crust, hardened by adversity, is found the gentleness of woman. The kind word and the kind treatment draw from his bosom the precious fragment of his great poem lying there, and he hands it to the prior with the words, "Here, Brother, is a portion of my work which you may not have seen; this remembrance I leave with you; forget me not."³

In this manner do we catch glimpses of the circumstances under which the great poem was written. The author suffered much; but his sufferings purified his soul and raised him out of the transitory into the sphere of the permanent and the ideal. They were his purgatorial fire. Nor should we judge him rashly. We should be lenient towards the gall his pen has dropped, for it has been distilled in his soul by the exile, poverty, persecution and degradation to which he was subjected. "If," says one who reveres him, "from the dearest illusions of youth, wrapped in the halo of a benevolent imagination, the wickedness of men has thrown you out of the circle of your activity, your affection, your early hopes and aspirations, into the midst of cruel deceptions; if you have been deeply sensitive like Dante, and like Dante have suffered the persecutions of an age that never pardons one raising himself above it; then, and then only have you the right to condemn his explosions of wrath."⁴

V.

But if the *Divina Commedia* contained only the ventings of private spleen—if it were simply the effect of a mind seeking self-glorification; or were it merely an esoteric expression of some unor-

¹ Mais ce qu'il raconte, c'est sa propre conversion. Edmond Scherer, *Litt. contempor.*, p. 60.

² It is the same peace the poet sought from world to world:

—"quella pace,
Che dietro a' piedi di sì fatta guida,
Di mondo in mondo cercar mi si face." *Purgatorio*, V., 61-63.

³ Balbo, *Vita.*, p. 290; *Cantù. Histoire des Italiens*, t.v., p. 484.

⁴ *Cæsar Cantù, l.c.*, p. 516.

thodox clique¹—it would not live as it has lived, nor would it deserve to rank among the great world-poems. These outbursts are the least portions of it. The poet's soul was too great to be tied down by any party or a slave to any transitory bond. Raised a Guelf,² circumstances and his convictions throw him into the Ghibelline party, but he finds words of rebuke for both Guelf and Ghibelline. Both have run into extremes; he knows not which to censure most;³ so, raising himself above both, he finds the path of honor in making a party for himself.⁴ In like manner did he burst the bonds of passion that held him to earth. And so he walks through exile and suffering, his soul dwelling apart from and far above the fleeting and transitory; reading in all things the ideal beyond sign and symbol; treading this earth as though it were a mere shell whose mysterious murmurings bring him tidings of the sea of eternity and infinitude far beyond; bearing in his heart a love pure and bright and elevating, that raises him up when he has fallen and bears him triumphantly through trial and temptation. At a tender age—in his ninth year⁵—when the bloom of innocence is still upon his youth, a glance at a child, younger than himself by some months, awakens in him consciousness and enkindles in him a spark of love sweet and pure and ideal; and the spark grows into a flame, and the flame burns clear and steady, a beacon directing his whole career. He has risen to a New Life. The child grows to womanhood, marries another and dies young, all unconscious of the love that consumes her poet-lover. And the poet-lover also marries other than his first love, and has children born to him, and grows in greatness and influence, and becomes a leader of men in his beloved Florence, one to be relied on by his friends and feared by his enemies. Still the passion of his boyhood becomes the cherished ideal of his bosom. He goes astray, but the thought of the loved one reclaims him; another demands his care and attention, but he communes with this one in his dreams and has visions of her in glory. He sings of her in his waking hours. Her image is the talisman whereby to banish all unworthy thoughts and desires. He extols her; he idealizes her; he embalms her forever in his immortal poem. He identifies her with, and makes her the impersonation of, his favorite study, Theology; and henceforth the name

¹ Such were the opinions of Ugo Foscolo, Rossetti, Aroux. See Cæsar Cantà's reply to Aroux in *Histoire des Italiens*, t. vii., p. 531.

² Balbo, *Vita*, p. 229.

³ L'uno al pubblico segno i gigli giallo,
Oppone, e l'altro appropria quello a parte,
Si ch'è forte a veder qual piu si falli.—Paradiso, vi., 100–102.

⁴ Di sua bestialitate il suo processo,
Farà la pruova, si ch'a te fia bello,
Averti fatta parte per te stesso.—*Ibid.*, xvii., 67–69.

⁵ *Vita Nuova*, ii.

of Beatrice shall stand before men as the synonym of whatever is inspiring in love and ennobling in womanhood. The passion of boyhood followed her to the heavenly abode in which he fancied her, and waxed with years into a most ideal and spiritual influence until it finally ripened in the poet's heart through long and laborious study, into the fulfilment of his early promise "to say of her what was never said of any woman."¹ This spiritualized type of womanhood stands out unique in the whole range of literature. It is Dante's own creation; rather it is the creation of the Christianity that reveres and honors the Virgin Mother. Love was the actuating principle of the poet's life. Not love of woman only, but love of country, love of study, love of religion; and not simply love, but love enlightened and strengthened by a Faith that pierces the veil of the visible and transient and beholds the regions of the spiritual and eternal.²

Dante's love for the religion of his birth grew in him into a passion. Neither the Guelf hatred of his youth, nor the Ghibelline hatred of his later years, against the persons of several Popes, ever for a moment obscured his mind to the truth of the doctrines of the Church or the sacred office of the Papacy. In his view, the greatness of ancient Rome was decreed solely to render it worthy of being the Holy Place in which should sit the successors of the great Fisherman.³ The mystical vine of the Church still grows, and Peter and Paul who died for it still live.⁴ He holds by that Church; he begs Christians not to be moved, featherlike, "by every wind of doctrine." "You have," he tells them, "the Old Testament and the New, and the Pastor of the Church who guides you; let this suffice for your salvation."⁵ With this profound respect for the Church, he loved her ceremonies, her dogma, her teachings, her institutions. He to whom the heavens and all that they contain were symbols of the spiritual essences they veil, could not fail to grasp the poetry and the meaning of every prayer and ceremony and office of that Church who, through whatever is in and about her temples, speaks eloquently to men in sign and symbol. There is not a stone in her cathedrals that has not its mystical meaning; there is not a garment with which her priest vests himself that is

¹ Vita Nuova, xliii.

² See N. Tommaseo *L'Inferno*, Int. p. xlvii.

³ La quale, e 'l quale, a voler dir lo vero,
Fur stabiliti per lo loco santo,
U' siede il successor del maggior Piero.—*Inferno*, ii., 22-24.

⁴ Pensa che Pietro e Paolo, che moriro
Per la vigna che guasti, *ancor son vivi*.—*Paradiso*, xviii., 131-132.

⁵ Avete 'l vecchio e 'l nuovo Testamento,
E'l Pastor della Chiesa che vi guida:
Questo vi basti a vostro salvamento.—*Paradiso*, v., 76-78.

not emblematic of some spiritual truth ; there is not an anthem or antiphon in her offices that does not help to draw out the beauty and significancy back of it all. "The elements and fragments of poetry," says the Dean of St. Paul's, in his charming monograph, "were everywhere in the Church—in her ideas of life, in her rules and institutions for passing through it, in her preparation for death, in her offices, ceremonial, celebrations, usages, her consecration of domestic, literary, commercial, civic, military, political life, the meanings and ends she had given them, the religious seriousness with which the forms of each were dignified—in her doctrine and her dogmatic system—her dependence on the unseen world—her Bible. From each and all of these, and from that public feeling, which, if it expressed itself but abruptly and incoherently, was quite alive to the poetry which surrounded it, the poet received an impression of greatness and beauty, of joy and dread."¹ How far the poet made use of the impulses emanating from one and all of these influencing agencies is known only to him who has made a complete and thorough study of the great poem embodying their inspirations. For we must not lose sight of the fact that the poem is, in all the grandeur and depth of its mystical meaning, made up of the spirit and doctrine of the Church.² The spites and personal animosities are but specks scattered here and there upon the whole surface of crystalline beauty. Shining out in pristine splendor is the Spiritual Sense. Let us now glance at the philosophy and doctrine underlying that Sense.

VI.

There is a common ground on which meet all supreme intelligences. It is the region of the Ideal. It is ascended only by the long and arduous labor of study and thought. There meet poetry and philosophy in their highest soarings. They meet and converse and stand upon the footing of mutual understanding. Poetry is permeated by the philosophic spirit, and philosophy dons the garb of poetry. Few are the souls assembled upon that supreme height. Plato and Virgil dwell there ; so do Shakespeare and Goethe. And, consummate singer, profound philosopher and skilled theologian, by every right and title, as being each and all of these, there also is the home of Dante. Sweetest of singers, he is at the same time profoundly scientific ; his mental vision sees the nicest intricacies and the most delicate distinctions ; eminently religious, he also gathers up the fragments of ancient mythologies and ancient systems that he finds stranded upon his age, and pieces them to-

¹ Rev. R. W. Church, *Dante*, p. 111.

² "Dante cristiano, cristianissimo sempre nel Poema e in tutte le opere ; Dante Cattolico sempre. . . ."—Balbo Vita, *Lib.*, ii. Cap. ii., p. 232.

gether, giving them deeper import in the light of the Christian mysticism in which he is immersed. "He brought back," says Giotto, "the Gentile mythology and symbolism to their source, rendering them anew esoteric and poetic."¹ He made them wholly subordinate to the Christian spirit, and by means of them conveyed practical lessons that are balm to the weary and drink to the thirsty. In like manner did he treat the science of his day. He made it the handmaid of the great spiritual truths he would impart. For this reason it is of small moment whether his theories be superseded by others apparently more probable; the moral and spiritual lesson still remains, and still speaks to the same human heart and the same human aspirations. So also did he make use of allegory.

Allegory there was before the time of Dante. Vision, too, was there. Such were the visions of Alberic;² such the vision of Paul³ and many others.⁴ The language of allegory and vision was the favorite mode of conveying spiritual advice.⁵ But all previous visions and allegories are to the great allegorical vision of Dante what the old plays and stories out of which our own Shakespeare constructed his immortal masterpieces, are to those masterpieces themselves. In the one case and in the other, we may trace phrases and expressions and conceptions and even whole trains of thought to their sources; but to what avail? In the one case and in the other, the master-mind has given to the phrase or sentence a new application and a larger scope, and with grasp of purpose and sureness of aim, has reset sentence and phrase in a sense in which through all time they will be recognized as the ideal form. To achieve this is the exclusive mission of genius. And in a marked degree was this the mission of Dante. Critics find fault with his occasional coarseness of diction. True it is that Dante does not employ words with the view of concealing the image he would portray. His descriptions are always vivid. Whatever there is in his poem that is beautiful or tender—and much there is of beauty and tenderness—he expresses with delicacy and sweetness the most exquisite; but when the poet would describe the loathsome and the horrible, he makes use of language best calculated to leave a loathsome or horrible impression. Critics should not forget that elegance and prettiness of phrase are not grandeur

¹ Del Bello, Cap. x., p. 214.

² Tommaseo. *L'Inferno*, p. 416. Discorso: Altre visioni infernali.

³ Ozanam. *Dante et la Philosophie Catholique au XIII^e Siècle*, p. 473.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 484-491.

⁵ Ozanam calls attention to the general analogy between the passage of the soul through the spheres of the Paradiso and the favorite titles of the ascetic treatises of St. Bonaventura: *Itinerarium mentis ad Deum*; *Formula aurea de gradibus virtutum*; *De vii. itineribus aeternitatis*. In *loc. cit.*, p. 335.

and strength; that they are wholly incompatible with grandeur and strength; that if Dante were always elegant and pretty in his phrasings Dante would never have been great or sublime, nor would his poem tower through the vista of the ages one of the grandest monuments of human thought and human skill ever conceived and executed. And the secret of it all lies in the poet's intense earnestness.

This earnestness asserts itself throughout the poem chiefly in three lines of thought: 1. A devoted patriot, loving his country, suffering for it, and yearning for its welfare with all the energy of his being, he launches notes of warning and denunciation against its vices, its enemies, and its false friends, and with invective the most scathing vilifies all who seemingly stand between it and its well-being. This burning patriotism has made the poem the great national epic.¹ 2. A child of the Church, true and attached, though at times wayward, the poet takes the liberty of a child free-spoken and free to speak, to utter words of censure against what he considers abuses in the external administration of the Church and the policy of her Pontiffs.² 3. Finally, Dante's chief mission, the prime motive of his intense earnestness, is the Spiritual Sense underlying his poem. This he has not left to be discovered. He takes the pains to inform the reader. He tells him that leaving aside all subtle investigation, the end and aim of his poem briefly put, both as regards the whole and its parts, is to remove therefrom men living in a state of misery in this life, and lead them to one of happiness.³ This he does upon an ethical basis.

The poet recognizes free-will as the basis of all human responsibility, and the consequent amenability of the soul to reward or punishment: "*Inborn in you is the virtue that keepeth counsel and that should guard the threshold of assent. Here is the principle whereto occasion of meriting in you is attached, according as it gathers up and winnows out good or guilty loves.*"⁴ The argument of his poem is man receiving at the hands of Divine Justice his deserts according to the nature of the actions he performs.⁵ Man passes from the darkness of sin and the wilderness of error into the light of truth and grace. The poem is a song of emancipation. It chants the break-

¹ L'Inferno, xxvi., 1-10; Purgatorio, vi., 75-151; Paradiso, xv., xvi. To understand the political aspect of the poem it is essential to read the author's work *De Monarchia* and some available history of that period, say Villani or Cæsar Cantù.

² Inferno, xix., 88-117; Paradiso, xviii., 115-136; xxvii., 19-66.

³ Sed omnia subtili investigatione, dicendum est breviter, quod finis totius et partis est, removere viventes in hac vita de statu miserie, et perducere ad statum felicitatis. Epistola, xi., Ep. ad Kani Grandi de la Scala, §15.

⁴ Purgatorio, xviii., 61-66. See the whole of this important passage. Cf. Summa, ii., I, quæst., cxiv., Article 4.

⁵ Ep. xi., § 11.

ing of the bonds of sin, and the passing into the light and freedom of the children of God. It is a song of hope. Evil is indeed mighty, and great is the havoc it plays among souls; but mightier still is God's grace. It is a song of light and life. Its tendency is upward and onward to the triumph of spirit over matter. It is ever pouring into our souls to the music of

"One clear harp in divers tones,
That men may rise on stepping-stones
Of their dead selves to higher things."¹

The poem is, therefore, practical. The thought, the energy and the earnestness of the whole age are concentrated upon it. Speculation abounds in it; but it is in order that knowing all the better one may do all the better. The poet is careful to tell us that if he speaks by way of speculation, it is not for the sake of mere barren words, but rather that such may tend to action.² The intellect is made for truth; its ultimate perfection consists in the contemplation of truth.³ The poet never forgets that true wisdom consists in right-knowing and right-doing.

VII.

In the development of this thought have we the mystical meaning and central idea of the *Divina Commedia*. It is the drama of human nature sinning, struggling against vice, straining after perfection, and making for the Supreme Good by means of Knowledge and Power: the primary knowledge of one's duties towards oneself, one's neighbor and God, and the larger knowledge of the relation and coördination of those duties in the light of philosophy and theology; the power flowing from this knowledge aided by prayer and grace and the assistance of the unseen, spiritual world.

The element that gives life to the knowledge and makes effective the power, is Love. Love is the inspiration of all knowledge. Without love there can be no philosophy;⁴ it is the form—the soul—of philosophy.⁵ Be it remembered that philosophy is not, in the intention of Dante, mere speculation. It is an intimate union

¹ Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, I., i.

² Ep. xi., § 16. "Non ad speculandum, sed ad opus inceptum est totum."

³ Così della induzione della perfezione seconda le scienze sono cagioni in noi; per l'abito delle quali potemo la verità speculare, ch'è ultimà perfezione nostra, siccome dice il Filosofo nel sesto del *Etica*, quando dice che'l vero è'l bene dello intelletto."

Convito, ii., 14, p. 153, Ed. Fraticelli.

⁴ "A filosofare è necessario amore." *Convito*, Tratto iii., Cap. 13.

⁵ Amore è forma di filosofia. *Ibid.*

of the soul with wisdom in all-absorbing and undivided love.¹ Therefore it is that only those living according to reason can become philosophers. Those leading merely the life of the senses can know or experience naught of the mysteries and consolations of this true philosophy.² Nor can intelligences exiled from their supernal home, such as fallen angels and damned souls, philosophize, for the reason that love has become extinguished in them and malice prevails.³ Love is the soul of philosophy; wisdom is its body; morality its beauty; such is the underlying conception of Dante's doctrine.⁴ He recognizes no truth that is not a ray of the Divine Intelligence; no good that does not flow from the Infinite Love; no beauty that is not clothed in the morality born of the Eternal Law. "*The Alpha and Omega of all writing that Love reads me is the Supreme Good that contents this Court.*"⁵ So speaks he in his sublime vision to the Apostle of Love. And he enlarges upon it in this fashion: "*By argument of philosophy, and by authority descending hence, such Love must needs on me be stamped; for Good, so far as it is good and comprehended as such, enkindleth Love, and enkindleth it all the greater as more of goodness is therein comprised. Therefore, towards that Essence—so supreme that every good which is found outside of It is but a ray of Its light—more than towards aught else, it behooveth the mind of each one discerning the truth whereon is based this evidence, to move in love.*"⁶ From that Divine Essence have come all things; to the same should all things tend. And as regards man, both reason and revelation urge him to keep for God the sovereign use of all his loves.⁷

Nor does the poet stop here. With depth and force and admirable grasp of expression, he penetrates to the workings of Love in the Godhead. He determines It to be not only a principle of Light, but also a principle of Life. Here he is mystical, sublime, suggestive. He stands upon the highest plane of Christian philosophy. He contemplates the Trinity in the creative act. He beholds the Triune Godhead in the bosom of the Word. And thus the Word, which is the central fact of all history, the central thought of all philosophy, the central germ of all speech, becomes for Dante the central Idea of the *Divina Commedia*. He says: "*That which dieth not, and that which can die, are naught else than the splendor of that Idea⁸ which in His love our Lord begetteth. For that living Light⁹—which so goeth forth from Its source¹⁰ that it ceases not to be*

¹ Amore è forma di filosofia. Cap. 12.

² Convito. Tr. iii., Cap. 13.

³ Paradiso, xxvi., 16-18.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 45-47.

⁵ The Word, the Son.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, Cap. 14.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 25-36.

⁹ The Word.

¹⁰ The Father.

one therewith,¹ as well as with the Love² that maketh Three-in-One—of Its bounty³ unites Its rays as though mirrored in nine subsistences,⁴ Itself remaining eternally One and Undivided. Thence It descends to the ultimate potentialities, passing down from act to act, till It makes no further than brief contingencies;⁵ and these contingencies I understand to be things generated, which the moving heavens⁶ produce with and without seed."⁷ The sum and substance of this sublime doctrine is that Love produces all things, from the heaven of heavens and the celestial spirits down to the least and most evanescent creature. With St. Thomas the poet here holds the influence of the heavenly bodies as secondary causes.⁸ With the Angelic Doctor he also holds that beings are perfect in proportion as they reflect the Divine attributes:⁹ "If burning Love disposes and stamps the clear view of the Prime Virtue, all perfection is there acquired. Thus was the earth once made worthy of all the perfection of living things; thus was the Virgin made a mother."¹⁰ And so, the Ideal becomes the standard of all beauty. Grand vistas of thought here open up to our contemplation; but we must not tarry. One remark, however, may be permitted. It has been well said: "See deep enough and you see musically; the heart of nature being everywhere music if you can only reach it."¹¹ If it has ever been given to human intellect to look back of sign and symbol and behold the essence and relation of things, it has been given to Dante. And this is why he has seen so musically. He sees the harmony of virtue and justice and suffering all blended in their true relations; and the harmony fills him with wonderment, and its music enters his soul, and he sings it in accents so sweet that he who lets the sweetness enter into his heart, may well say with the poet on hearing Casella sing one of his own hymns: "Still sounds its sweetness within me!"¹²

¹ Ego et Pater unum sumus. Joan. X., 30.

² The Holy Ghost, the Third Divine Person.

³ i.e., of Its goodness, not through necessity.

⁴ "In the nine heavens, or in the nine motive intelligences." BIANCHI.

⁵ i.e., extending down from the more active to the less active till It comes to the least existence in the chain of created things.

⁶ "Divine Light, moving the heaven produces things generated."—TOMMASEO.

⁷ Paradiso, xiii., 53-66.

⁸ Corpora caelestia sunt causa inferiorum effectuum mediantibus causis particularibus inferioribus, quae deficere presunt in minori parte.

Virtus corporis caelestis non est infinita; unde requirit determinatam dispositionem in materia ad inducendum suum effectum et quantum ad distantiam loci, et quantum ad alias condiciones. Summa, I., quæst. cxv., Article vi., ad. 1 & 2.

⁹ Ibid., ii., I. Quæst. iv., Article 5.

¹⁰ Paradiso, xiii., 79-84.

¹¹ Carlyle. Heroes and Hero-Worship, Lect., iii.

¹² Che la dolcezza ancor dentro mi suona. Purgatorio, ii., 114.

VIII.

That deep insight into the moral and physical world has enabled Dante to see in Love not only the Light and the Life of all things created—and even of the Uncreated One in Whom Love, Light, and Life are one infinite identical activity—but also the principle and source of sin and passion: “*Neither Creator nor a creature . . . was ever without Love, be it natural or be it spiritual; and well thou knowest. The natural is always free from error; but err the other may by evil objects, or by excess, or by defect of vigor. Whilst well-directed in the first, and in the second it moderates itself, it cannot be cause of evil delight; but when to ill it turns aside, or when with more care than it ought, or with less, it runs after good, then against the Creator works His own creation. Hence it behooves you to understand how Love should be in you the seed of every virtue as well as of every deed deserving punishment.*”¹ And so the poet continues, holding with the Angelic Doctor that there is no passion—not even excepting Hate—that does not presuppose Love.² For, as the great Schoolman teaches, there is no passion that is not moved towards, or does not rest in, some object. And it is so because of some kind of harmony or adaptability between the subject moved or resting and the object towards which it moves or in which it rests. But Love consists in the accord of the one loving with the object loved.³ Now the human heart seeks the good, yearns for the good, loves the good, and is content only in the possession and enjoyment of the good. This is a primary law. No system of philosophy has ever soared higher than that question every Christian child learns from the Little Catechism: “Why did God make you? God made me to know Him, to love Him, and serve Him in this world, and to be happy with him forever in the next.”⁴ It contains the solution of the whole mystery of man. It names the Supreme Good towards which tends all Love.

But it frequently happens that the Supreme Good becomes clouded from man's vision and intent, and he seeks bliss in loving the lesser goods that are more palpable to his view. Herein is how Love becomes the source of all that is sinful in thought and word and work on the part of man. 1. Now it is Love excessive. As such it seeks happiness in imaginary perfection, or the praise of men, or a sense of self-sufficiency that causes one to ignore one's origin, or helplessness, or dependency upon the aid of Grace. This is Pride or Vanity. Again, this worldly love impels one to seek happiness solely in the external sufficiency that wealth can bring.

¹ Purgatorio, xvii., 91–105.

² Summa I. ii., Quæst. xxvii., Art. 4.

³ Summa. I. ii., Quæst. xxix, Art. 2.

⁴ A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Lesson I., On the End of Man.

This is Avarice; and it is at the root of treasons, frauds, deceits, prejudices, anxieties, violence, and insensibility to misery.¹ The same Love seeks bodily gratification either in eating or drinking to excess—and this is Gluttony; or in the enjoyment of the carnal and sexual appetites—and this is Lust. 2. Now it is Love defective. As such, it is lax and sad in attending to things spiritual, and is known as Sloth. 3. Finally, it is Love distorted. As such, it grudgingly looks upon a neighbor's prosperity as an obstacle in the way of one's preëminence—when it is called Envy; or it changes into wrathful feelings that seek to be revenged for real or fancied wrong. It is then called Anger. These various forms of misapplied Love are known as the Seven Capital Sins, and are the chief sources of all evil.²

The poet takes these sins and all the sins that flow from them, and holds them up to our view in all their loathsome nakedness. And he does so, not as a mere matter of sport, but that he and his readers may learn to hate them, and from witnessing their torments may get some faint conception of their enormity, and may be led to exclaim: "*Wisdom Supreme, how great is the art Thou showest in heaven, on earth, and in the evil world, and how well Thy Goodness dispenseth justice!*"³ The poet transports us to the Hell that he so vividly pictures; we there are told the dire consequences of sin to persons and families and peoples upon earth; we meditate upon the dread lessons embodied in this song of woe and wrath, of wailings and regrets, and our soul learns to recoil from aught that could break the golden chain of Law and Love with which the Creator binds all His creatures to Himself. It is a solemn preparation for the more practical lessons conveyed in the other two parts of the poem. Their Spiritual Sense at once becomes apparent. Indeed, it is the clue to their proper appreciation. For the great poem gives us, as no other purely human production gives us, "the solution of the great, eternal, and sole problem of our life, namely, deliverance from evil and final bliss in God as the source of all Truth and all Love."⁴ Let us, in a cursory manner, follow the evolution of that Spiritual Sense.

IX.

The poet is in the midway of life.⁵ He has become entangled in the woods of sin and error. He is beset by three predominant

¹ Summa. II. ii., Quæst. cxviii., Art. 8.

² Summa. I. ii., Quæst. lxxxiv., Art. 4. See Inferno, xi, and Tommaseo's tract appended to this Canto, entitled *Dottrina Penale di Dante*, p. 120. The poet gives the genesis of the Seven Capital Sins on the same line of reasoning with St. Thomas, whom we have here followed in substance. See Purgatorio, xvii., 106-139.

³ Inferno, xix., 10-12.

⁴ Hettinger, *Die Göttliche Komödie*, p. 56.

⁵ Inferno, I., i.

passions that are about to devour him. These are the lion of pride and over-vaulting ambition, the leopard of concupiscence, and the she-wolf of avarice. Mary, Mother of Divine Grace, sees his plight, and forasmuch as he has venerated her, she does not abandon him in his peril. She sends Lucy, or Illuminative Grace, to his assistance. Lucy commands Virgil—that is, Reason—enlightened by her directions, to save him. As he is about returning upon his evil course,¹ reason tells him that he must take another road if he would escape the beasts and be rid of the errors of his ways.² He obeys. The journey is long and dismal and dreary. Sometimes the poet is discouraged and desires to return.³ Sometimes he requires, in an especial manner, the assistance of Virgil; as when the Roman poet turns him around and with his own hands closes his eyes that he may not behold the Gorgon; and all of which means that there are certain sins and temptations in life that cannot be overcome by human nature unaided by reason and God's redeeming grace. Such is sensuality, which hardens the heart, even as the head of the Gorgon was fabled to turn to stone those looking thereon. In giving the figure the poet would have us look to the spiritual sense: "*O you who have sane intellects, note the doctrine veiled beneath those strange verses.*"⁴ At times Virgil himself is unable to make headway against the powers of darkness. But a heavenly messenger comes and dispels all dread, and opens the entrance, and forthwith Dante and his guide walk securely and without molestation.⁵ They find no further opposition. Indeed it is only by reason of heavenly grace that Virgil is able to lead Dante through the dread regions: "From on high descends virtue, which enables me to lead him."⁶ Whereby the poet would teach that human reason, good and admirable as it may be in itself, is not sufficient to contend against the world of passion and the evil spirits that inspire wrong-doing. Again, at times the poet would rest. But there is no resting-place for the soul struggling with evil till it frees itself therefrom. And so we have the grand lesson of work and energy in overcoming indolence and sloth and evil habit: "*It now behooveth thee to shake off all slothfulness, said the Master, for fame comes not to him who sits on down or lies abed; without which whoso consumes his life, leaves on earth such trace of himself as smoke in air or foam on water. Arise, therefore! Conquer thy panting with the soul that conquers every battle, so be it that it sinks*

¹ Ibid. xv., 50-52.

² E non c'era altra via che questa per la quale io mi son messo. Purgatorio, i., 62-63.

³ Inferno, viii., 100-103.

⁴ Ibid. ix., 50-63.

⁵ Inferno, ix., 100-105.

⁶ Purgatorio, I., 68-69.

not down with its heavy body." ¹ And we have the further lesson that mere sorrow of the lips and outward observance of the law, or reception of the Sacraments, will avail little unless accompanied by change of heart and sincere detestation of sin: "He cannot be absolved who doth not first repent; nor can he repent the sin and will it at the same time, for this were contradiction to which reason cannot consent." ² Thus, in picturing sin and its punishment, in such colors as human conception has never approached, the poet is teaching us the lesson of struggle with self, of abhorrence of wrong-doing, and of making effort towards personal holiness.

This is especially the great lesson of the *Purgatorio*. Before entering these realms of hope and sweet contentment amid great suffering—hope and contentment because accompanied by Love—the poet must first be washed of the grime and filth that have clung to him in the evil world, the contemplation of which so saddened his eyes and weighed down his heart. He is, furthermore, to be gird with a lowly and pliant rush; "*Go then,*" says Cato, "*and gird this man with a smooth rush; then wash his face so that therefrom thou mayst put away all filthiness; for it were unseemly, with eye obscured by any cloud, to go before the first Minister who is of them of Paradise.*" ³ In which words is conveyed the wholesome lesson that after one has been cleansed from the grime of sin, one must gird on the plain rush of humility; for as pride is the chief of all capital sins, so is humility the foundation of all virtue; and with meek and lowly heart must one walk in the narrow way, fearing lest one fall and remembering that one carries heavenly treasures in a frail vessel. And once the soul has set out upon the road of virtue and right-doing, she must not go back: "*Let not your returning be hitherward. The Sun which is now rising will show you where to take the mountain at an easier ascent.*" ⁴ In proportion as the soul becomes enlightened by prayer and meditation will she find all the easier the ascent up the mountain-heights of perfection.

It is only through humble obedience in all right-doing and humble submission in all right-thinking that the soul can attain the great object of this pilgrimage. This is the only road to liberty. And liberty of spirit is what the poet seeks: "He goeth in search of liberty, which is so dear, as he knoweth who for it gave up his life." ⁵ He goes in search of the highest spiritual good. And he can only advance in the light: "*To go upward in the night*

¹ Inferno, xxiv., 46-54. Cf. Wisdom, ix., 15.

² Purgatorio, I., 94-99.

³ Purgatorio, I., 71-72. Cato taking his own life rather than renounce liberty, is symbolical of the soul, destroying all selfishness that it may attain the light and freedom of spiritual life. See Bianchi's Ed. Div. Com., note to those lines p. 245, Ed. 1863; p. 253, Ed. 1868.

⁴ Inferno, xxvii., 118-120.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 106-108.

may not be."¹ Only by grace and mercy can one progress in the path of perfection. Still freedom of will is respected, and so the poet may retrace his steps in the darkness: "*Well might one therewith turn downward and wander about the hillside whilst that the horizon holds the day closed.*"² The poet arrives at the gate of purgation. It is guarded by an angel whose face is radiant with beauty and who bears a sword and keys. There are three steps. The first is of white marble so polished that therein the poet may see himself mirrored. The second is a fire-burnt rock tinted more deeply than perse,³ with a cross through its length and breadth. The third is porphyry flaming as blood spirting forth from a vein.⁴ The poet begs for mercy, striking his breast, and asks to enter. Here, indeed, the allegorical veil is so thin that whoso chooses may penetrate it in the light of Catholic doctrine and Catholic practice. "We need hardly be told," says one who has written a charming book instinct with beautiful thoughts and suggestions, "that the gate of St. Peter is the Tribunal of Penance. . . . The triple stair stands revealed as candid Confession mirroring the whole man, mournful Contrition breaking the hard heart of the gazer on the Cross, Love all aflame offering up in satisfaction the life-blood of body, soul and spirit:—the adamant threshold-seat as the priceless merits of Christ the Door, Christ the Rock, Christ the sure Foundation and the precious Corner-Stone. In the Angel of the Gate, as in the Gospel Angel of Bethesda, is discerned the Confessor; in the dazzling radiance of his countenance the exceeding glory of the ministration of righteousness; in the penitential robe the sympathetic meekness whereby restoring one overtaken in a fault, he considers himself lest he also be tempted; in the sword the wholesome severity of his discipline; in the golden key his divine authority; in the silver, the discernment of spirits whereby he denies absolution to the impenitent, the learning and discretion whereby he directs the penitent."⁵

And now, repentant and with good resolve, the soul goes forth on its final pilgrimage of purification. There is still upon it the impress of the Seven Capital Sins. To rid itself of the last trace of these is its first endeavor. And as the angel brushes away the trace of one sin after the other,⁶ and the soul advances farther and farther in the way of perfection, it finds itself growing all the lighter for having gotten rid of the burden of its imperfections, and

¹ Purgatorio, vii., 44.

² *Ibid.*, 58-60.

³ "Perse is a mixture of purple and black, the black predominating."—Dante. *Convito*, iv., 20.

⁴ Purgatorio, ix., 90-102.

⁵ Maria F. Rossetti, *A Shadow of Dante*, pp. 112, 113. See the Dissertation of Tommaseo to Purgatorio, ix., *Penitenza Correzione*.

⁶ Purgatorio, xii., 140 *sqq.*

the more eager is it to mount to the summit.¹ Charity takes possession of the soul and she would see all men ascend with her: "*O, race of men,*" admonishes the poet, "*born to fly upwards, why at a little wind fall ye so down?*"² He also upbraids us for allowing ourselves to remain blind to the beauty and splendor of things spiritual, and becoming absorbed in things earthly: "*Heaven calls you, and revolves around you, showing you its eternal beauties; and your eye gazes only on the earth, wherefore He who discerns all chastises you.*"³ We here perceive too that in affliction and trouble the soul has come to recognize the Hand that punishes: "*He who discerns all chastises you;*" and she accepts her trials as coming from the hand of a loving Father, and offers them up in expiation for past sin and as a source of meriting.

Finally, the poet passes through the fire that cleanses him whole, and Virgil says to him: *The temporal fire and the eternal hast thou seen, my son, and thou art come to a part where of myself no farther do I discern. With reason and with art have I brought thee hither. Take for guide thine own good pleasure; beyond the steep ways and the narrow art thou. Yonder is the sun that shines upon thy forehead; here are the young grass, the flowers and the shrubs, which the land of itself alone brings forth. Whilst rejoicing come the fair eyes that with their weeping made me go to thy aid, thou mayst sit down and mayst go among them. Await no more word nor sign from me; free and upright and sound is thy Free-will, and it were wrong not to do its bidding; wherefore thee over thyself I crown and mitre.*"⁴ The soul has conquered. Therefore Virgil leaves the poet free from the dominion of his passions; more than free, a king crowned triumphant over himself; more than king, a mitred priest, ruling the cloister of his heart, his thoughts and his affections, and mediator and intercessor before the Divine Mercy for himself and those commending themselves to his prayers. Through speculation and through right-doing has he been led by reason as far as reason can lead him. He now passes into the hands of Divine Theology and Grace Illuminant, and in the radiance beaming from her eyes and dispelling many a mist of ignorance, he will read profitable lessons of wisdom and of spiritual perfection. He meets Beatrice. Henceforth neither fear of eternal torments, nor hope of mere earthly reward, nor consolations of sense and feeling will be his incentive to right-doing. Love alone will lead him. In the company of Beatrice, basking in her sweet smile and receiving her loving admonitions, will he walk from sphere to sphere and traverse the

¹ —Pungémi la fretta

Per la impacciata via.—Purgatorio, xxi., 4-5.

² Purgatorio, xii., 95-96.

³ *Ibid.*, xiv., 149-151.

⁴ Purgatorio, xxvii., 127-143.

Empyrean. She begins by showing him how great is the distance between the mere science of reason and speculation and the high and holy Light that will now be a guide to his feet. The poet asks: "*But why so far above my sight flies thy wished-for speech, that the more my vision strains to see it the more it loses it?*" And Beatrice answers: "*To the end that thou mayst know the School that thou hast followed; mayst see how its doctrines can keep pace with my speech; mayst also see that your way is from the Divine way as far apart as from earth in distance speeds the highest heaven.*"¹ Henceforth the soul will tread God's way. And in what consists that way?

It is a way not unknown to every soul seeking after spiritual perfection and union with God. It is the way of personal purity and holiness. It hath been well and beautifully said: "The only obstacle to spiritual growth lies in ourselves. Goodness Divine, which 'spurns from Itself all envy,' is forever shining in ideal beauty and drawing the soul with cords of love. If we do not see the heavenly vision, it is because we are blinded by sin; if we do not press forward towards it, it is because we are clogged by sin."² But the whole mission of the Church—that to achieve which she makes use of all the means at her command—is to enable the soul to divest herself of sin and become united with the Supreme Good. In the Church flows the spirit of regeneration. She is the mystical vine perennially shooting forth branch and leaf and luscious fruit throughout the ages, and in every fibre retaining vigor and freshness. Her mystical sap continues to nourish souls and impart to them a healthful and health-giving growth and development. And that mystical sap is none other than Love Divine. It glows in the heart of every member grafted on her mystical body. It inspires the spirit of charity and fosters the communion of saints. Now it is in this spirit that Dante wrote his great poem, and in this spirit must that poem be read. It is the story of a soul seeking perfection in unison and harmony with the Church, by the light of Faith and borne upward by the supreme law of Love.

Now, indeed the scales of selfishness, and worldly wisdom, and earthly motives and measures fall from the poet's eyes and he sees things as they are in the light of God's presence. The beauty of virtue and personal holiness, the nobility and dignity of obedience, the exalted grandeur of humility, the great excellence of poverty and the numberless blessings accompanying it; the necessity of being detached from things of earth; the intrinsic worth of riches, honors and pleasures; the wonders of the Incarnation and Redemption and the exhaustless oceans of grace flowing

¹ Purgatorio, xxxiii., 82-90. Cf. De Imitatione Christi, Lib., iii., Cap., 31, 32.

² A Study of Dante, Susan Blow, p. 65.

therefrom; all these subjects, and many more as well, are dwelt upon directly or impliedly, amid the music of the spheres and the Hosannas of angels and saints—catching up and re-echoing in heaven the hymns and offices sung by the saints on earth—with a wealth and gorgeousness of expression, and a sustained music, borrowed from the heavenly music that had entered the author's heart and welled forth again with a rhythm and a harmony becoming the sublime theme. All this is of the essence of the Illuminative way. The soul has grown detached from the things of this world. She has renounced sin and the vanities of life. She has become enamored of the spiritual goods of prayer and the sacraments. The Love and the Light wherewith she is filled diffuse themselves upon her neighbor in charitable thought and kind word and helping deed. Hence, she is zealous for the spiritual well-being of her neighbor and seeks to make it assured by prayer and edification. She has left the way of Nature, "which respecteth the outer things of a man," and adopted those of Grace, "which turneth itself to the inward."¹ She finds comfort in God alone, and regards all else as vain and trifling, except in so far as it leads to God.

In this spirit, and animated by these sentiments, does Dante move from sphere to sphere—each moment soaring higher on the wings of love; for in his own words, "*The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence of burning love and of living hope, which conquer the Divine Will*"²—each moment revealing to him some new truth—each moment adding to the brilliancy of the smile of his Beatrice as she approaches nearer to the Fountain of Light and Life and Love—admiration on his lips, love in his heart and ecstasy in his soul; all in harmony with that "harmony and sweetness that can never be known save where joy is everlasting."³ The splendor of the eternal Sun that illumines all the lights in Heaven, now comes within his vision and through the living light appears the shining substance of the glorified body of the Redeemer, and its radiance dazzles his gaze: "Here is the Wisdom and the Power which opened the roads between heaven and earth."⁴ And now Beatrice would wean the poet from interpreting all things in her countenance, and initiate him into a higher state of spiritual life by contemplating heavenly things in themselves: "*Why*," she says, "*so enamors thee my face that thou turnest not to the beautiful garden which flowereth under Christ's beams? Here is the Rose wherein the Divine Word was made flesh; here are the lilies whose odor attracted into the*

¹ De Imitatione, Lib. iii., Cap. 31, 5.

² *Regnum caelorum* violenza pate

Da caldo amore e da viva speranza,

Che vince la Divina Volontate.—Paradiso, xx., 94-96.

³ Paradiso, x., 146-148.

⁴ Paradiso, xxiii., 38-39.

good way." ¹ It need not be said that Mary is here that mystical Rose. She is preëminent among all God's creatures. Her effulgence adds to the brilliance of the whole heavens. Saint and angel love her with a special love and pay her a special honor of praise and veneration, their deep love attracting them towards her as the babe is drawn towards the mother. ² She is extolled with a special fervor and her name resounds with a special enthusiasm. ³

It were an injustice to the Catholic spirit of the poem to overlook the loving homage paid to Mary from its first canto, when she sends succor to Dante, to its last, when St. Bernard sings her praises with a sweetness of expression, a depth of philosophy and a tenderness of feeling that have never been surpassed in human language. Critics may not have any sympathy with this devotion; but none the less should they appreciate its beneficial influence upon conduct, art and letters. Dante gave us the lofty creation of a Beatrice—so ideal and spiritual—because he was devout to Mary. Were there no Virgin-Mother, of immaculate purity and dowered with every grace and every virtue, there would have been no ideal of womanhood, such as Dante conceived; and let us add, the less reverent Goethe would have missed in his masterpiece the central conception of the purifying influence of woman's love, and the meaning-laden words—"the Eternal-Womanly—*das Ewigweibliche*—draws us on and upward"—would have remained uninscribed among the ineffaceable expressions of world-thought.

The poet ascends into the Empyrean. He is now in a transition state passing from the Illuminative Way to intimate union with the Godhead. New and wonderful visions present themselves to his admiring gaze, bringing home to him truths equally new and wonderful in that resplendent temple "bounded only by love and light." Beatrice tells him in accents clear and sweet: "*We have issued forth from the last body to the heaven which is unbodied light; light intellectual full of love; love of true good full of joy; joy surpassing every sweetness.*" ⁴ Round him flashes a living light. Its effulgence at first dims all vision; but gradually its grandeur and beauty and significancy unfold themselves. "The Divine Light first is seen in the form of a River, signifying Its effusion on the creatures, the living Sparks issuing from It are the Angels; the Flowers they ingem,

¹ *Ibid.*, 70-75.

² Paradiso, xxiii., 121-126.

³ Così la circolata melodia
Si sigillava, e tutti gli altri lumi
Facen sonar lo nome di MARIA.—*Ibid.*, 109-111.

⁴ Noi semo usciti fuore
Del maggior corpo al ciel ch'è pura luce;
Luce intellettuale piena d'amore,
Amor di vero ben pien di letizia,
Letizia che trascende ogni dolzore.—Paradiso, xxx., 39-43.

the Saints. Then in the changing of the River's length to the Lake's roundness is figured the return of all creatures into God as their Centre and End."¹ Finally, the Light Divine assumes the shape of a Rose composed of souls burning with Love and basking in the unveiled Presence: "In form of a white-rose displayed itself to me the holy company whom Christ in His own blood espoused." And the hosts of angels flit like bees, descending to the Rose and ascending to where its bliss abideth evermore—in a constant tremor of love and gladness, and dispensing throughout the Rose the peace and the ardor with which they were thrilled.² This wonderful Rose exhales the love with which it is fed, and it thrills with the gladness diffused by the three-fold light of God, penetrating the whole universe and making it to smile. High up does his Beatrice take her place, reflecting in dazzling radiance the eternal glory.

The poet now enters upon the Unitive Way, under the guidance of the contemplative—*quel contemplante*³—St. Bernard. Benign joy suffused his eyes and his cheeks, in gesture kind as befits a tender father.⁴ In this state the soul has no further need of doctrine; she has transcended the reasonings and imaginings of men; she is about to enter upon the beatific vision, and who more competent to induct her than he who experienced it in his own life and beautifully described it in his book?⁵ "This joyous existence," Bernard cautions the poet, "will not be known to thee, if thou only holdest thine eyes down."⁷ Whereby the Saint would inculcate that one must first be detached from all things of earth if one would enjoy the state of perfect union with God. But this is not given to man upon his own merits; it is a special favor of Divine Grace and Mercy, and can be obtained only by earnest prayer. And so, Bernard beseeches for the poet the special grace of ecstatic union with the Godhead, through Mary's intercession, in that marvellous outburst of song that exhausts all that can be sung or said in praise of Heaven's Queen, though it seems never to exhaust the admiration bestowed upon it: "*Thou maid and mother, daughter of thy Son; thou humble and high over every creature: thou didst so ennoble our nature that He who made it disdained not to be of its make. In thy womb was enkindled the love through whose warmth in the eternal peace this Flower has thus sprung. . . . In thee is mercy; in thee is pity; in thee are mighty deeds; in thee is united all the goodness that may in creature be. . . . I beseech*

¹ Maria F. Rossetti. *A Shadow of Dante*, p. 272. In which the author refers to Venturi as the source of this interpretation.

² Paradiso, xxxi., 1-3.

³ Paradiso, xxxi., 7-17.

⁴ Paradiso, xxxii., 1.

⁵ Paradiso, xxxi., 61-63.

⁶ In his treatise on the Love of God. See Görres, *La Mystique* t. i., p. 101.

⁷ Paradiso, xxxi., 112-114.

thee that thou wouldst with thy prayers unloose every cloud from his mortality, so that the highest bliss may be unfolded to him and that thou preserve whole and blameless his affection after so great a sight."¹ Forthwith the saint's prayer is granted. "My vision becoming undimmed," says the poet, "more and more entered the beam of light, which in itself is Truth."² The veil has dropped. The poet enjoys the ecstatic vision. He penetrates essences. In that single glance mysteries the most profound become unravelled. He sees the harmony existing through all grades of the universe, bound together in ineffable beauty and order—their music penetrating his soul—and all united in the golden bonds of Love Divine. He sees and feels; the sweetness born of the vision is infused into his heart; but language has no word in which to express the splendor he beholds and the rapture that thrills him. And the vision confirms him in good resolve and strong purpose. In that blissful state, where each longing is perfect, ripe and whole,³ his yearning for the Good and the Perfect changes to determination of will to seek and possess them: "*Already*," he tells us, "*my desire and my will rolled onward, like a wheel in even motion, swayed by the Love that moves the Sun and all the stars.*"⁴ Henceforth the sole law of his action shall be the Love that rules the universe. In obedience to the Divine Will shall he work out his mission on earth; in all things resigned thereto and living therefor; walking through life in the clear light of Faith, with heart beating high in Hope, and soul aflame with all-embracing Charity.

X.

Such is the Spiritual Sense of the *Divina Commedia*. We have traced it, a golden thread running through the whole extent of the poem; we have found that sense, with the prophet of old, dictating the first line;⁵ its notes resound strong and clear in the very last verses of the sublime canticle; on it are strung the brightest pearls of thought and the rarest gems of diction; by means of it are all the parts of the great poem solidly welded together, and unity and harmony given to the whole; it has been the chief inspiration of the poet, sustaining him in his highest soarings and dictating his sublimest songs. Other senses are to be found in the poem. In parts it has its political sense; in parts it has its purely moral sense; in others again it has its philosophical sense; but the sense that pervades the whole, determines its meaning and bearing, and makes of it the great world-poem, is the Spiritual Sense. The other senses are employed critically: to find fault, or to sound the

¹ Paradiso, xxxiii., 1-40.² *Ibid.*, 52-54.³ Paradiso, xxii., 64.⁴ *Ibid.*, xxxiii., 143-145.⁵ Isaiah, xxxviii., 10.

note of warning ; to praise or approve, or commend ; to expound a theory or explain a difficulty. The Spiritual Sense is used constructively. It has built up the poem into that grand climax of thought and aspiration—the sublimest ever reached by human genius—with which the poet closes. The clue to this sense, indeed every clue to the poem, is to be found in the *Paradiso*. Carlyle called this portion, to him, “a kind of inarticulate music.”¹ It is not to be wondered at. The music of the *Paradiso* is the music of spiritual life ; and the music of spiritual life can be interpreted only by those into whose existence spiritual life enters as a living and breathing reality. The music of that sublime canticle is a music articulate and familiar to each religious man. It throbs in his every aspiration. His ear has been attuned to its exquisite cadences ; its harmony vibrates through the pages of the spiritual book he reads ; it is reëchoed in the sermons and exhortations he hears and in the hymns he chants ; his whole life is the clearest commentary upon this great poem, rather it is itself the living poem of which Dante has made a marvellous though still imperfect translation. In the sublimest themes of that translation he recognizes echoes of the thoughts, sentiments and aspirations that in his own breast are continuously humming unspeakable music. The fervor and love and high thought that are all so grandly intensified in the terse rhythm of this great poem, are the fervor and love and high thought that are daily moving tens of thousands of men and women, to lead the spiritual life herein portrayed in obedience to the Love Divine that rules hearts and sways the heavens in perpetual harmony. The religious man, in sauntering through the vast aisles and chapels of this noble Cathedral of song, here admiring a tender and touching picture, there gazing upon a scene of terror portrayed in vivid colors, again drinking in the sweet and inspiring strains of its clear organ-tones, feels that beneath its solemn arches his soul may rest, for he is at home in his Father’s House.

¹ Heroes and Hero-Worship. Lect., iii.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

WHAT IT IS, AND WHAT ARE ITS RELATIONS TO IRELAND.

THE objection made in the British Parliament and press to Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme for Ireland—that it would be a dissolution of the British Empire—naturally leads to the questions—What is the British Empire? And how would home rule for Ireland dissolve it?

Self government in Ireland could only produce that result, either because it was such an infraction of the constitution as would destroy it, or because the practical and necessary operation of the government could not be afterwards carried on, or because the Articles of Union were sacred and irrevocable, to remain untouched and unchanged for all time. But the British Empire has no constitution covering and applicable to the whole Empire; theoretically, therefore, Parliament might deal as it pleased with a part of the people or territory, and yet not infringe the constitution.

But, first, let us see what the British Empire is—of what it is composed—how it has grown up and how administered.

The British Empire and the Kingdom of Great Britain are by no means the same. The latter consists only of the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, while the former embraces them and all provinces, colonies, and possessions everywhere and of every sort. These exist in all the continents and seas of the world. The most extensive, populous, and valuable are, of course, those in India. And to show their extent, we have only to recollect that Gibbon, in describing the power and vastness, the almost incredible extent of the Roman Empire, estimated that a hundred and twenty millions of people were subject to it, and to note that these provinces of British India alone have a population of two hundred and forty millions, or just twice as many as the whole Roman possessions in the palmiest days of that city. And it has taken only a little over a century to acquire this immense territory and subjugate this enormous number of people. The East India Company existed long before any part of India was actually seized. Historians generally fix the battle of Plassey, which was fought on the 23d of June, 1757, as the real beginning of the British Empire in the east. But Fort George, which was the nucleus of Madras, was the first ground acquired, and this was not until 1765. Once begun,

however, the acquisitions have been made steadily and rapidly—the latest being Burmah, which has a population of four millions and an area of two hundred thousand square miles, and is represented to be fertile, and of special value because it gives an outlet for trade towards China.

British India, at this date, contains thirteen provinces and one hundred and fifty feudatory states and principalities, all under English administration. About one-third of the territory, with fifty-five millions of people, is still under the rule of the hereditary rulers, permitted by the English to maintain courts and make a show of authority and sovereignty; the British, meanwhile, being the actual rulers.

This enormous dependency is not under any uniform government applicable to the whole and administered in the same way throughout. On the contrary, each province or department has its own laws and civil polity. Aymer, Bevar, Mysore, Coorg are under the direct control of the Viceroy or Governor-General, who is appointed by the Crown. He is assisted by a Council, and they together exercise all legislative and executive powers; they not only make laws, but also execute and administer them. Every executive order and every legislative statute runs in the name of the Governor-General-in-Council. The Viceroy is king and prime minister and, in some sense, the Parliament.

The Council, which aids and coöperates with him, is two fold:

1. The Executive Council, consisting of six, besides the Viceroy, and constituting something like a cabinet.

2. The Legislative Council, of which the Viceroy and the Executive Council are members—the remainder being made up of the governors of the provinces where the Council sits for the time, and official delegates from Madras and Bombay, and certain nominated members, intended to represent non-official communities, both European and native. This body has no fixed time or place of meeting, but assembles wherever and at whatever time legislation is supposed to be needed.

The two largest, most populous, and richest departments—Madras and Bombay—are under the control of governors appointed by the Crown, while Bengal, the Northwestern Provinces, and Punjab are governed by lieutenant-governors; and Oudh, the Central Provinces, British Burmah, and Assam have assigned to them officers called Chief Commissioners, who, like the Viceroy, the Governors and Lieutenant-Governors, are appointed by the Crown and have the same class of powers.

But besides these, there are, as we have already said, about one hundred and fifty feudatory provinces, each with its own native hereditary ruler, called by different names in different states, and

each, in its own domestic economy, governed by its own laws and customs—all, however, under the general control and supervision of the Viceroy. The native prince or potentate is the nominal governing power, the Viceroy the real, who, however, does not interfere except in case of necessity.

As one general system of government does not exist, neither is there a general code of laws. One legislative body and one code are generally considered enough for any people; but British India has no less than three law-making bodies, and no less than five sets of laws:

1. And chief of these is, of course, the British Parliament, whose acts, however, do not affect India or any part of it, unless specially named in the law itself.

2. The statutes of the Viceroy and Council.

3. The statutes of each separate division acting for itself alone.

4. The old Hindu and Mahometan laws relating to inheritance, which are of great antiquity and are still preserved and in force.

5. Laws relating to particular castes or races.

The religion, if it can be called so, of this region is as various as the laws and governments:

1. Hindu—numbering about one hundred and forty millions.

2. Mahometan—about forty-one millions.

3. Buddhist—about three millions.

4. Sikhs—about one million three hundred thousand.

5. Christians—chiefly Catholics—about nine hundred thousand.

This curious and anomalous condition of things is not peculiar to this part only of the British Empire; the same thing applies to every part of it, not excepting the Kingdom itself, for there in that little island we see the same variety of race, of language, of religion, of law, and of government, as in India.

The British Isles consist, as we all know, of Great Britain, Ireland, the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands, altogether making a small and compact territory; and it would seem that here, at least, the people ought to be content with one uniform government and one general system of laws. But things are almost as variant there as they are in India. England is Episcopalian and Scotland Presbyterian; they have each their own land laws, their own mode of administering justice, and their own judicial system and marriage laws. Ireland is Catholic, and besides being governed as Scotland is by the King and Parliament, it is put under the control and surveillance of a Lord-Lieutenant who resides in Dublin, and there holds a court resembling that of Her Majesty in London, and is in fact the representative of the Crown in Ireland.

But the Isle of Man presents one of the most curious and vener-

able spectacles in the world. Neither it nor the Channel Isles, containing a population of a hundred and fifty thousand, and being parts of the Kingdom, are represented in Parliament. They stand to this day under what is claimed to be one of the freest countries of the earth, and one in which the personal rights of the citizens are protected to a greater degree and with more scrupulous care than anywhere else, monuments of taxation without representation. Perhaps it was the precedent afforded by them that Mr. Gladstone proposed to follow when he brought in his bill for home rule in Ireland, one of the provisions of which was that Ireland should elect no members to the Imperial Parliament, but should nevertheless be liable to taxation by that body.

The Isle of Man has a Governor appointed by the Crown. It has a Council which constitutes the upper branch of the legislature, and a lower branch called the House of Keys. These three bodies constitute the Court of Tynwald, and all sit and act together in the deliberations of that tribunal. Acts of Parliament do not affect the Isle at all, unless specially named. The Governor is Captain-General of the forces; he presides in the Council and all courts of Tynwald, and is the sole Judge of the Chancery and Exchequer courts. The Council consists of the Lord Bishop of the diocese, the Attorney-General, the two Deemsters and the Clerk of the Rolls, the Water Bailiff, the Receiver-General, the Archdeacon, and the Vicar General—all except the last appointed by the Crown. The House of Keys has twenty-four members, elected—and here comes in a surprising feature—by the male owners and occupiers of property and the female owners of property. While the woman's rights people in this country have been agitating and haranguing and petitioning Congress and State legislatures to give the ballot to women, these have been voting from time immemorial in the Isle of Man.

What are called Deemsters are judicial officers having peculiar and exceptional functions. Exactly when or how they originated, who made them and who gave them their name and jurisdiction, cannot be ascertained. The order has existed so long that no authentic records can be found of its beginning or origin, but they are claimed, and believed, to be successors of the Druids, and are regarded by the simple people with something of the same veneration supposed to have been felt for that order.

We are sure the reader will agree that all this exhibits a most remarkable and interesting spectacle. Here is an island, close to the shores of Great Britain, forming an integral part of the Kingdom, paying its taxes for the support of the whole nation, and yet not represented in the body which imposes taxes upon it. The same man is Governor-General, President of the Council and of the Court

of Tynwald, Judge of the Court of Exchequer, Chancellor, and Commander-in-Chief of the army.

Guernsey and the other Channel Islands stand to the Empire very much as does the Isle of Man. Alderney, Sark and Herm, and the smaller adjacent islands, are in the same bailiwick with Guernsey; and they, like the Isle of Man, have no representation in Parliament, though they have home rule, but still of a different variety. They, of course, have a Governor appointed by the Crown, and their Parliamentary Assembly is of very mixed material, consisting as it does of a Bailiff, twelve Jurats, an Attorney-General, the beneficed clergy and twelve delegates elected by the people. No other legislative body ever brought together anywhere is like it, for in it are men appointed by the Crown, men who are members by virtue of some other official position, parsons sent there from England by their bishops or designated by some layman who holds a benefice, and, lastly, delegates chosen by the people. But this body, made up of what seems to be such discordant elements, must be, nevertheless, a wise and prudent one, and those islands must be good places to live in, for the whole revenue raised by taxation is only £10,000 a year, and the population is as peaceful, quiet, kind, and law-abiding as is to be found anywhere on the globe.

Although the Channel Islands have belonged to Great Britain for many centuries, yet the old Norman French is the prevalent language, while English is taught in the schools and modern French used in the courts. The old Norman system of land tenure is still in force, the land being divided into very small parcels, five acres constituting a pretty good farm.

While the Channel Islands still use the old Norman French, the Manx language continues to prevail in the Isle of Man, and is used almost entirely by the peasantry.

The possessions already mentioned, extensive as they are, constitute by no means the greatest and most important of the British Empire. To give a detailed account of them would be almost as tedious as is the list which Homer furnishes of the ships that brought the Greeks to Troy. Nevertheless, a list of them, together with some sketch of the manner in which the larger part are governed, is essential to the proper development of the idea attempted to be enforced in this article. As we have already given some account of India, it may be well enough here to add that it is not all that Britain owns in Asia, and we will continue the descriptive list with the other territories in that country or adjacent to it.

There are, in addition to India, Aden, Ceylon, Cyprus, Hong Kong, Labrian, Perim, and the Straits Settlements. These are not insignificant, since Ceylon has a population of two millions eight hundred thousand, the Straits Settlements of five hundred and

twenty-five thousand, and Cyprus of two hundred thousand. Perim has but one hundred and fifty men, women, and children, all told, and is probably the smallest and most insignificant place upon which England has set her foot. But we may be sure that there was some special reason for seizing that little island, for the rulers of the British Empire are not content alone with land of agricultural, mineral or commercial value, but want as well all places that may be of service as military posts, where supplies can be stored for army and navy, and ships of war or trade can touch with convenience and profit. It has been less than ten years since Lord Beaconsfield acquired Cyprus, which is financially an expense, but of incalculable value to Great Britain whenever the great war in the East, which may blaze out any day and is sure to come at last, takes place. There her ships can find harbor, water and supplies; there her troops can be stationed within easy reach of Egypt and the Suez Canal on the one side, and Asia, the Dardanelles, the Black Sea, and Constantinople on the other. Perim may have some such smaller value, and may be a Cyprus on a diminished scale.

In Europe, besides Great Britain itself and Ireland and the adjacent Islands, the Empire has Gibraltar, Heligoland, Malta, and Gozo. Gibraltar is nothing but a fortress maintained at considerable cost, and Malta was obtained and held for the same reasons as Cyprus is, and is of much the same importance and value in military affairs. It was seized less than a hundred years ago, and, though it is only about seventeen miles long and nine broad, it has remarkably fine and safe harbors, and is convenient to all parts of the Mediterranean and the countries surrounding it.

In the new growth of Africa and the scramble of all nations for it, we may be sure that Great Britain has not been idle or procrastinating, but has got a good share. She has held some positions in that country for more than two centuries, and has continued to add to her original foothold whatever she could take and was found valuable. Her mode of proceeding is simple and summary. She sees something, she covets, and forthwith an Act of Parliament is passed making it a part of Her Majesty's dominion and establishing over it such form of government as seems to suit the country, the people and the situation. Her first acquisitions were of course on the coast, but she has recently annexed, in the usual manner and in a very quiet and matter of fact way, a great part of the interior, and has called it by the general name of Bechuanaland. Her provinces in Africa are Cape Colony, Ascension, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Gambia, Gold Coast, Lagos, Mauritius, Natal, Sierra Leone and St. Helena.

Cape Colony, which embraces the extreme south of the continent

of Africa, is large and prosperous and has about one million and a quarter of inhabitants, the Gold Coast four hundred thousand, Natal four hundred and twenty-five thousand, and Mauritius about four hundred thousand.

In Bechuanaland one man is both governor and legislator; in him are centered and combined all the legislative and executive powers and duties over an area already containing several millions of people and capable of supporting not less than forty millions. He makes the laws, he executes the laws, and does the former by proclamation merely. But the native population is ignorant, and not barbarous only, but savage and know-nothing, and cares for nothing beyond the daily wants.

Half a century ago the great and fertile region now called by the general term of Australasia was almost unknown and entirely unexplored. Such parts of it as were reduced at all from the native condition of the country, were used for the exportation of criminals. Now they are great and prospering provinces, all owned by the British. They are the Fiji Islands, Rotumah, New South Wales, Norfolk Island, New Zealand, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, Western Australia and New Guinea.

Port Jackson, in New South Wales, was first established as a penal colony in 1788. Then it was a wilderness, inhabited by a race of blacks probably the same, originally, as the negro, but modified somewhat by climate and surroundings. Now it is a highly civilized country, where all the arts, enjoyments and refinements of life can be found.

Settlements were made from time to time in other parts of Australasia, and governments placed over them whenever any considerable number of British subjects got together. How rapid this progress has been a reference to the census will show.

The Fiji Islands,	128,414 people.
New South Wales,	921,268 "
Queensland,	309,913 "
South Australia,	312,781 "
Tasmania,	130,541 "
Victoria,	961,276 "
Western Australia,	32,958 "
Total,	2,797,151 "

We are accustomed to speak and think of the growth of the United States as unequalled anywhere else, yet it took three centuries to bring its population up to three millions, which it was at the time of the Revolution. But in about half a century Australasia has attained the same strength and numbers that the American colonies had when they took the perilous step of declaring them-

selves independent. And this estimate only embraces Australasia proper, not taking in New Zealand, which is practically a part of it. Great as has been the rate of progress in Australasia, that of New Zealand has exceeded it largely. It has not been very long since the natives of that island were cannibals. In 1851 its whole population was estimated at about twenty-six thousand; on the 30th of June, 1885, it was, by accurate account, 616,229, nearly all of them British born subjects, since the Maoris, or aborigines, were only forty thousand.

Only a little more than a year ago the British Parliament passed what is called the Federal Council Act of Australasia, forming a union somewhat similar to the Union of States in the United States and in the Dominion of Canada. The Act defines very fully the mode of choosing this Council and its powers and duties. And while, in the event of that country ever wanting to separate from the mother country, this would enable it to act with much greater concert and effectiveness, its present tendency is, undoubtedly, to attach it more strongly to the British Crown.

We have made this necessarily brief reference to and account of the British colonies, provinces and dependencies in Asia, Africa and the semi-continent of Australasia, and come now to the other great continent, America, and the seas and oceans surrounding it.

The Dominion of Canada stretches from ocean to ocean across North America where it is broader than any part of the United States. It has a thrifty population of four millions and a half. To hold the provinces together and give them an identity of interest, the Canada Pacific railroad has been constructed at very great cost, striking the Pacific Ocean at Puget Sound, and giving Great Britain a short route to her Australasian and Asiatic possessions, over her own territory, in one direction, while the Suez Canal does it in another. This will greatly facilitate her intercourse with the East, and be a route that no European nation can interfere with. That a great city will be built on Puget Sound, and that it will become a mart for Asiatic trade, the present situation clearly indicates.

Canada, or rather British America, will share so largely in the benefits of this trade and development that a motive for cutting loose from Great Britain will be wanting. She now has self-government, and is content to come in, in addition, for a good share of the glories and wealth of the Empire.

This great space of the world's surface occupies nearly the whole of the northern part of the continent. And Great Britain has been just as careful and thoughtful in planting herself on the southern part of the American continent as the northern; and her possessions there, though not so extensive, are, nevertheless, well located. They

are Honduras and Guiana; and a look at the map will show that they are within easier reach of and more accessible to the United States, Mexico, Central America and the West Indies than any part of South America.

Guiana constitutes, as respects variety of people, a very fair epitome of the British Empire. Its population consists of:

Native Negroes,	80,000
Cross between Indians and Chinese,	10,000
East Indians,	42,000
Chinese,	6,000
From Madras and the Azores,	8,000
Negroes from West Indies,	14,000
Europeans,	10,000

The places named so far are on the mainland; but islands seem to have an especial attraction for the English. In American waters and adjacent to both continents they have the Bahamas, Bermudas, Falkland Islands, Jamaica, Turks and Caicos Islands, Leeward Islands, Newfoundland, Trinidad, and the Windward Islands. So far as the West Indies are concerned, they belong naturally to the United States, yet Great Britain holds several of the most important and valuable. How much they keep her in her commercial rivalry with this country, we the people of the United States know.

The British have been as fortunate or as far-seeing and wise in selecting and securing military posts everywhere as they have been in obtaining the richest and most valuable possessions. The little ocean of the Mediterranean has always been, and will of necessity continue to be, the great theatre of naval conflicts and naval operations. The East is, and has been, the volcanic war region. It was necessary, therefore, for a first-class power which had such diverse and general interests to place itself in a good attitude there. This England has done with the most consummate wisdom and far-seeing sagacity. She has Gibraltar at the entrance to the sea, inside she has seized Malta, which, though only a small island, yet has harbors in which all her navy can safely ride at once. The purchase of a controlling interest in the Suez Canal, and the acquisition, the fortification and garrisoning of Cyprus, were almost simultaneous acts and parts of the same great purpose—to protect and secure her route to Asia and put her in good position for the war that she knows must come. And these places, it is to be observed, geographically and naturally belong to other nations. The Channel Islands are parts of France, Cyprus of Turkey, the West Indies of the United States, yet Great Britain owns them all.

Any account of the British Empire, in the pages of a periodical, must necessarily be brief; yet this has been long enough to enable

us to repeat pertinently the questions asked at the beginning: What is the British Empire? And what holds it together? It exists in every part of the world, civilized or savage. Among all the savage peoples of the earth its subjects are to be found. White, red and black take part alike in making it up. It is the most incongruous body, and at the same time the most wonderful, ever created. Among most other great nations and powers there has been, and is, some degree, at least, of homogeneity. But in the British Empire there is absolutely none, not even in Great Britain. There are found Celts, Saxons, Normans, and Welsh. The remainder of the Empire is made of materials that it would seem impossible ever to get together, or to hold together if once united. And it is not only difference of race, but of religion and customs also, that adds to the singularity of the condition of things and the apparent difficulty of governing all these people, keeping them content, or at least quiet, and procuring their acquiescence in and submission to one authority, and that authority located in a little island distant from most of them; for all these territories and people are ruled from London. Whatever home rule or domestic constitution they may have, in London resides the supreme authority over all. And in some cases the actual ruling power remains in London, as in the case of Borneo, which is on the other side of the world from England, yet is governed by a Board of Directors which has its office and holds its sessions in London.

To form an adequate idea of the extent of this Empire it is only necessary to know that it covers one-seventh of the surface of the earth and contains one-ninth of its population; and that its territories and dependencies have been so well selected and so judiciously located that its ships of war and peace can go nowhere, into no ocean or sea, that they will not find some of their own lands to shelter them.

If the question were asked, as an original proposition, could such an empire as this, composed of nations and peoples of different and divergent races, colors, religions, tastes, habits, customs, and physical characteristics, and the parts separated from each other by the whole circumference of the globe, be first constructed, and when constructed afterwards maintained, the universal answer would be, No. But, finding it in actual existence, the next inquiry would be: What holds it together, what is the cement that unites and the power that welds these discordant elements? Is it force or trade or mutual advantage, or all combined? All have contributed; but it has been mainly by reason of the fact that whenever a territory was acquired, either by conquest, purchase, or peaceful annexation, the first thing done was to study the people, find out how they had lived, what were their tastes and desires, what would

please and what displease them, and then adapt this rule to the situation. The religion, the customs, and the laws of the conquered or bought people were respected. They were granted home rule and permitted to govern themselves, as to their domestic affairs, which is all the bulk of mankind knows or cares anything for. Besides this, the English have traded with these people, bought whatever they had to sell, if not with money, at least with something the savage heart delighted in; and have gradually improved their physical condition.

Of course, all this has been of incalculable advantage to the people of Great Britain and has made the British Empire far the most powerful that exists or ever existed. We do not by this mean military power so much as social, commercial, financial, and political. It and its citizens have more to do with the business and trade of the world than all the rest combined; they transact more and influence more of it. They come all the distance across the Atlantic and almost monopolize the trade of Mexico, which lies at our very door. A man in the United States who wishes to send a letter to Brazil, has to send it by way of England. And this is one source of her strength. She has managed to make herself useful.

From the foregoing narration, it is very clear that the British Empire has no constitution in the sense understood by us in the United States; and that the one principle that runs through and pervades what is called the Constitution of the Empire is that each part of it may be and should be governed in the manner specially suited to it and best calculated to secure its advancement, prosperity, and fidelity; and that this process, so far from being a dissolution of the Empire, or a threat in that direction, is the real cause of its stability and power.

To this principle, enforced everywhere else, and ruling in all the dealings of the Imperial Parliament with all other parts of the Empire, there is one exception, one land and one people that has never been allowed to rule itself, whose religion has been persecuted, who has been denied the enjoyment of the privileges of citizenship on account of its faith, whose customs have been trampled upon, whose ancient laws and usages have been suppressed; this is Ireland, which though a conquered province, has been administered and governed in a different manner from any other part of the Empire. And all this has been done while Irish generals were leading the armies of the Empire to victory, and Irish soldiers fighting her battles wherever an enemy was to be met.

To conciliate the Welsh, these people have been allowed to preserve their old traditions and customs.

In the Channel Islands the successors of the Druids are the judges who administer justice, and even the women are allowed to vote for the men whom the British Parliament permits to make their domestic laws and manage their domestic affairs. The Hindus and Buddhists, who have such a stolid adherence to their religion that there is small hope of ever making Christians of them; the fanatic and aggressive Mahometans, who are not content to be allowed to practice their religious rites in peace and quiet, but want to make proselytes of the world, have their own religion. The laws under which they lived before their conquest was effected are still carefully guarded and protected, courts are specially constituted to keep alive their old laws, and the real property of the country is held and inherited under them. Toleration and favor are shown to every phase of belief, or non-belief,—to the Pagan, the Heathen, all Protestant sects, by whatever name designated; in brief, to all the world and all the peoples, except the Catholics of Ireland. Even Borneo, savage and ignorant Borneo, has two sets of courts; one to administer the laws made by the present government, and another the old Mahometan laws. And while the persecution was in progress on the alleged pretext that the Irish were not loyal to the Imperial Government, Catholic Irish soldiers were helping Wellington, an Irish general, to win the battle of Waterloo against a nation of Catholics.

These examples make the conclusion inevitable that, as self-government exists with the consent and by the establishment of the British Parliament in almost all parts of the Empire, and is, in fact, a settled and fixed rule, enforced at once whenever new territory is acquired by arms or treaty, nobody can object to self-government in Ireland on constitutional grounds. So far as the Constitution, so-called, regulates and provides for the matter, in any way, it is just the reverse, and demands and requires and makes it obligatory on the authorities to grant, in some form, to Ireland the same rights at home and on her own soil that Canada, Australasia, Borneo, Bechuanaland, the Isle of Man, and other places enjoy on their soil.

The Constitution, therefore, is not the obstacle. The reason for the prolonged, never ending denial to Ireland of equality with other British subjects must be looked for somewhere else—perhaps, in the Articles of Union between Great Britain and Ireland. We have recently examined that document, in view of its possible bearing on the questions now so important to the people of those countries and which are agitating them so profoundly, and found nothing in it to prohibit, in an even remote degree, any plan for home rule or self-government that Parliament may choose to adopt. But even if there was, is that compact to stand forever, let what will happen,

to be always sacred and inviolable, never to be touched, altered, or modified in the slightest degree, no matter what the emergency and how great the interests that demand the modification? Such a claim is neither law nor reason. As all such things are supposed to be done for the benefit of the parties concerned, and that is the principle that underlies all government, it would be nothing but stupid and criminal folly that should permit this law to stand unchanged when a change becomes necessary in order to accomplish the very results it was intended to bring about, but has failed to effect. Neither is it law, for in a matter of government merely no legislative body can bind its successors irrevocably or do any act that it or its successors cannot undo.

But we are not without precedent on this point. Parliament has already shown, in a most conspicuous and important way, one which touched the people of both islands on a matter always cherished by them, that the Articles of Union have no such sanctity as to interfere, in the least, with whatever measures it is thought good to pass.

Article V. of the Articles of Union provides: "That the church of that part of Great Britain called England and that of Ireland should be united into one church, and the Archbishops, Bishops, deans and clergy of the churches of England and Ireland shall, from time to time, be summoned to, and entitled to sit in, convocation of the United Church, in like manner and subject to the same regulations as are at present by law established with respect to like orders of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the United Church shall be preserved, as by law now established for the Church of England."

"And that the continuance and preservation *forever* of the said United Church as the Established Church of that part of the United Kingdom called England and Ireland shall be deemed and taken to be an *essential and fundamental condition of the Treaty of Union.*"

This article to continue *forever*, to be preserved *forever* and taken as an *essential and fundamental condition* of the Treaty of Union!

This was the very gist of the Union, its kernel—the feature that recommended it most to Protestant England—that gave the dignitaries and convocations control over the rebellious Catholics, that would furnish the means to keep them under foot, and ultimately stamp out their faith, while forcing its adherents, meanwhile, to support another. Surely it cannot be touched; whatever else falls, it must remain; it is an essential and fundamental condition of the Union; and if it has been repealed or abrogated, then the Union is already gone; it cannot exist after a fundamental and essential feature is destroyed. Yet that is exactly what has been done;

this article has been absolutely set aside and annulled, there is no longer any union of the Churches of England and Ireland. The Church has been disestablished in Ireland, and if the Articles of Union did not stand in the way of this, how is it that they can be claimed to be an obstacle now?

Neither the Constitution nor the Articles of Union, then, are incompatible with the measure for the self-government of Ireland. The real reason for opposition to it is the old one of hostility to the Catholics. It is said that the Orangemen of Ulster are arming to resist, and it has been reported, though denied, that Lord Wolseley says he is ready to lead them. Ulster is the province in Ireland where the Catholics are in a minority. Out of a total population in Ireland of 5,412,377, Ulster has 1,743,075, a bare majority of whom are Protestants. And Mr. Chamberlain, the leader of the Radical party in England, carries his home rule views so far that he actually wants to have a separate government for Ulster. He does not wish the Catholics and Protestants of Ireland to unite in one government for the whole, which shall consult the good of the entire island, but he proposes that while the Catholics in the other provinces may govern themselves, the Protestants in Ulster shall govern the Catholics of that province. He desires to accumulate government on Ireland, and let it still have the Imperial Parliament: one home government for Ulster and another for the remaining provinces combined. This scheme is, of course, foolish, and can never be adopted; and we only advert to it at all to furnish another example, if one were needed, of the motives which lie at the bottom of the opposition to Home Rule.

THE CHURCH AND HER HOLYDAYS.¹

OUR Lord sets forth His royalty clearly. He is a king. "For this was I born, for this I came into the world." The Wise Men of the East at His birth proclaimed Him a king; the representative of the Roman Emperor wrote on the cross the acknowledgment of His kingly rank. He spoke constantly of His kingdom. He disposed it to His twelve Apostles, the peers of His realm, as His Father had disposed it to Him; He committed the chief power to Peter. Standing as King of kings, the Queen Mother stands near him.

In this Kingdom the loyal subjects have their holydays, the birthday of the great King, the days that commemorate His mighty deeds, His campaigns, His victories, His triumphs; the days given to honor the twelve, whom He sent to conquer the world. Is it strange that in days when loyalty abounded in that Kingdom, when every heart throbbed with zeal to do and endure all for Him, the festival days of the Kingdom were celebrated with earnest, spontaneous outpouring of the heart? Loyalty cannot be purchased or manufactured; patriotism is heartfelt or nothing.

When the royal birthday comes, or the day of a great victory, or the deliverance of the land, and no flag is raised, no voice of gladness is heard, where men speak slightly of the monarch and his service, it is vain to say that the people are faithful in their allegiance, are enthusiastic in support of the throne. No; loyalty and patriotism are dead, and the men who boast most loudly of their fidelity may be put down as most to be doubted.

How do we stand as subjects of the kingdom of God on earth?

The Church, by one of her positive commandments, requires the faithful to sanctify certain holydays in the year, by taking part in the offering of the great sacrifice of the Mass and by abstaining from servile works. To many it has doubtless seemed strange that the holydays thus prescribed were not the same throughout the world, fixed irrevocably, and known by all in every country on the face of the earth. Still more strange has it seemed that in a republic like our own, where the Church, though the oldest of all the institutions existing, can boast of little more than three centuries and a half of history, there have been diversities before the recently held Third Plenary Council of Baltimore made a step towards absolute uniformity.

¹ Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii, A.D. MDCCCLXXXIV. Baltimore, 1886.

Yet so far as this country is concerned, the state of our feasts and fasts excited wonder, not only here, but even in Rome; for years ago the authorities there wrote to this country to inquire into the origin of the diversity.

The holydays of the Church in the course of its history are a kind of meter, showing the days of fervor and the days when faith grew cold, and when all that the spouse of Christ required of her children seemed an onerous burthen, which many sought to shift from their shoulders.

In the days of faith and fervor not only were the great festivals prescribed by the Church, those associated with the life of our Lord and his Blessed Mother, those intimately connected with the work of redemption, and the feasts of the holy apostles by whose ministry the Church was established and the channels of grace led through the world—not only were these kept reverently, but the patronal feast of each country, diocese, and church, the days of the most famous local saints were similarly honored. The devotion was general, and whoso refused to lay aside his implements of trade or traffic on their days was so condemned by public opinion that custom made the law.

The fame of many saints from being local became general, devotion spread to other countries, and then feasts were made obligatory throughout the Church. Devotion to particular mysteries also led to the establishment of special feasts, as in the case of Corpus Christi, to honor the real presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, and the institution of that sacrament.

The great commercial awakening of Europe that grew out of the Crusades was accompanied by a waning of piety and a manifestation of declining interest in the affairs of God and salvation as men's minds became more absorbed in worldly affairs. The institution of the Friars Minor, by Saint Francis of Assisi, was a direct effort to counteract the spirit of greed and worldliness which was sweeping over Europe; but the fervor of the Franciscan, of Carmelite, Dominican, and Augustinian, who joined in the new movement for the things of God, though it did much, did not triumph. Less and less Christian grew governments, grew nobles and people; more and more did old pagan ideas reassert themselves, and while Christian civilization declined, material prosperity became the great end and aim of man.

Then came the revolt of the sixteenth century. The Church had acquired a certain amount of material wealth, which was at once seized. This property diverted from the general wealth of the country was alleged to be an injury to the commonwealth. In the hands of the princes, their courtiers and favorites, it would lighten the burthen of taxation, establish great public works, found schools

and colleges, institutions for the relief of every human misery, houses where the poor were to acquire the skill to attain the great end for which man was created, earthly riches. But in some way or other this benevolent intention was frustrated, and whether we examine the history of England, France, Germany, Scandinavia, or, more recently, Spain and Italy, the most microscopic research fails to discover the institutions for the public good resulting from the money taken from the Church. On every occasion men were told how much good might be done, and ought to be done with this money, which lay, to use their expression, in a dead hand, and the world naturally looked to see the good that would be done. Was fifty per cent. even applied to any good use? Twenty per cent.? Ten per cent.? One per cent.? It would be hard to find even the one per cent.

Everywhere there is one record. The money and property was squandered without any regard to the benefit of the commonwealth, as it had been seized without any regard to God.

Everywhere, too, it had another effect. The poor were more impoverished. They found their case worse than before. Money was accumulated more in the hands of a few; a bridge, widening year by year, separated the rich and poor as if it spanned a widening gulf. Then it was discovered that the poor did not work enough. In that lay the whole cause of the state of things.

For this the Church was mainly responsible. A great part of the year was taken from work by the Church, which made so many holydays. Protestantism, therefore, at once swept away all the holydays, and Christmas remained almost alone to represent the Church calendar, and the Puritans even punished those who kept Christmas.

With men working all the year round, except on Sunday, wealth was to be general, the poor would thrive and prosper, and be happy and contented, no longer lured from great and ennobling labor by being called away every week to idle some days in church and prayer.

It was again unfortunate that this excellent theory did not work well. The poor seemed to grow actually poorer with all these days of labor than they had been before.

In spite, however, of all theory, the new ideas prevailed, and in Catholic countries men began to complain of the numerous holydays. Dazzled by the apparent prosperity of Protestant countries, they saw only the wealth in the hands of the few, the energy and activity in the pursuit of wealth; they failed to study the deepening degradation of the masses, in whom all Christian instinct, and thought, and hope were dying out, and who were becoming, like

harassed wild beasts, gaunt, conscious of ill usage, but unable to see the real cause or the real creators of their misery.

The Church was already planted in our present territory, and Catholic bodies had begun to form at several points with clergy attending them. Among these the holydays and fasts of obligation were observed according to the usages of the countries from which the settlers came, the feasts and fasts universally observed, and those introduced by the piety, national feeling, or gratitude of their ancestors.

The Diocesan Synod held in 1688 by Bishop Palacios, of Santiago de Cuba, fixed as holydays for that diocese, in which Florida was then embraced, and from 1776 to 1793 Louisiana also, the following: All the Sundays of the year, Circumcision, Epiphany, Purification, St. Mathias, St. Joseph, the Annunciation, Sts. Philip and James, the Finding of the Holy Cross, St. John Baptist, Sts. Peter and Paul, St. James, St. Anne, St. Lawrence, the Assumption, St. Bartholomew, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, St. Matthew, St. Michael, St. Simon and St. Jude, All Saints, St. Andrew, the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, St. Thomas, Christmas, St. Stephen, St. John, Holy Innocents, and St. Sylvester. Easter Sunday and the two following days, Ascension, Whit-Sunday and two following days, Corpus Christi.

A bull of Pope Clement X. added St. Ferdinand, St. Rose, National Patroness of the Indies; and a bull of Innocent XI. added St. Augustine, August 28th.

The fasting days were all days in Lent, the Ember days, the eves of Christmas, Candlemas, Annunciation, Assumption, All Saints, the feasts of the Apostles, except St. Philip and St. James and St. John, nativity of St. John the Baptist, all Fridays, except within twelve days of Christmas and between Easter and Ascension, and the eve of Ascension.

All Sundays in Lent, all Saturdays throughout the year, Monday and Tuesday before Ascension, and St. Mark's day were days of abstinence from flesh meat.

In Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, which were included in the ecclesiastical province of Mexico, the feasts and fasts were regulated by the Third Council of Mexico.

In these parts, besides those already given, the faithful observed as holy days of obligation: St. Fabian and St. Sebastian (January 20th), St. Thomas Aquinas (March 7th), St. Mark (April 25th), St. Barnabas (June 11th), the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin (July 2d), St. Mary Magdalene (July 22d), St. Dominic (Aug. 4th), the Transfiguration (Aug. 6th), St. Francis (October 4th), St. Luke (Oct. 18th), St. Catharine (Nov. 25th), the Expectation (Dec. 18th),

but not the Holy Innocents and St. Sylvester.—(III. Council of Mexico, pp. 111–112.)

The fast days were all days in Lent, except Sunday, eves of Christmas, Whit-Sunday, St. Mathias, St. John the Baptist, St. Peter and St. Paul, St. James, St. Lawrence, Assumption, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Simon and St. Jude, All Saints, St. Andrew and St. Thomas.

A distinction was made, however, between whites and Indians. As the latter lived a most precarious existence, and were frequently compelled to fast, and, moreover, could not always on holydays be near enough to a church to attend, the obligation on an Indian to hear Mass and rest from servile works was limited to a comparatively small number of feasts.

They were Sundays, Christmas, Circumcision, Epiphany, Candlemas, Annunciation, Sts. Peter and Paul, Ascension, Corpus Christi, the Assumption, and Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (III. Council of Mexico, p. 117). While the only fast days obligatory on the aboriginal Catholics were the Fridays in Lent, Holy Saturday, and Christmas Eve.

This was in virtue of a bull of Pope Paul III. in favor of the Indians, "*Altitudo Divini Concilii*," issued on the 1st of June, 1537. (Hernaiz, Coleccion de Bulas, I., p. 65; III. Concilio Mexicano, pp. 265–267.)

The exemption in favor of the Indians was universally recognized in Spanish America, and was regarded as for the benefit of the natives, so that when held as slaves, they could not be required to work on the other holydays which were not of obligation for them, though they were for the whites. There is nothing in this bull limiting it to the Spanish dominions, in fact, no European State is mentioned at all. It must, therefore, have extended to all parts of the country, and was as obligatory in Canada, and all parts under the diocese of Quebec, Louisiana, Maine, Central New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Louisiana, as in Mexico or Florida. Indeed, it must be in force in our Indian missions to-day, as it must have been in Maryland from the first.

It was found, however, that the holydays, even as restricted by Pope Urban VIII., were too frequently neglected, and Pope Benedict XIV., by his brief, "*Venerabiles Fratres*," issued on the 15th of December, 1750, extended to Spanish America the indult already granted to the kingdom of Spain. By this reduction the obligation of hearing mass and resting from servile work was limited to the Sundays of the year, Christmas, St. Stephen, the Circumcision, Epiphany, Candlemas, Easter Monday, Annunciation, Whitsun-Monday, Corpus Christi, Ascension, St. John the Baptist,

Sts. Peter and Paul, Assumption, St. James, Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, All Saints, the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and the Patron of each place. (Sinodo Diocesano de Santiago de Chile, p. 206.)

These would seem to have been the holydays of obligation in force in the parts of the country originally under Spanish sway when they were purchased by the United States or conveyed to us by treaty: Louisiana, in 1803; Florida, in 1821; Texas, in 1845; New Mexico, Arizona, and California, in 1848.

In Canada the feasts were those of the Reformed Calendar of Pope Urban VIII.; but as custom had made some others obligatory, Bishop Laval, on the 3d of December, 1667, expressly declared the feasts of St. Mark, St. Barnabas, St. Mary Magdalen, St. Luke, and St. Martin not to be of obligation, but he ordered that of St. Anne to be observed as a holyday of obligation in all the country of New France, "as it had pleased God for several years past to display, by many miraculous cures and succors, that this devotion is very pleasing to him, and that He receives graciously the petitions presented to him by her intercession." He also made the feast of St. Francis Xavier obligatory, and in 1687 that of St. Louis.

The holydays of obligation as recognized officially in 1694 were: Christmas, St. Stephen, St. John the Evangelist, Circumcision, Epiphany, Candlemas, St. Matthew, St. Joseph, "patron of the country," Annunciation, St. Philip and St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Peter and St. Paul, St. James, St. Anne, St. Lawrence, the Assumption, St. Bartholomew, St. Louis, titular of the Cathedral of Quebec, Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, St. Matthew, St. Michael, St. Simon and St. Jude, All Saints, St. Andrew, St. Francis Xavier, the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, titular of the Cathedral, St. Thomas, Easter Monday and Tuesday, Ascension, Whitsun-Monday and Tuesday, Corpus Christi and the patronal feast of each parish. (Register A, Archives de Quebec, pp. 535-537.)

These were the holydays observed in the French settlements in Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Illinois, as well as in Louisiana, Mobile, and the country west of the Mississippi, till that district passing under the Spanish rule was reclaimed about 1776 as part of the diocese of Santiago de Cuba. East of the Mississippi they continued to be in force certainly till the Holy See detached those parts of its territory from the diocese of Quebec and annexed them to the newly erected diocese of Baltimore.

France and Spain still recognized the kingdom of God and the festivals to honor the one true and living God, and the Son whom He had made King of kings, and of those whose love, fidelity, and

services in His cause deserved eternal renown were still kept. Poor England, once boasting to be Our Lady's Dower, was in rebellion, and persecuted with unrelenting hatred all who were loyal to the King, to the mother of the King, and His spouse. Ireland, bound to her by a cruel fate, experienced in her loyalty all the intolerance of successful rebels. In oppression and tears the Catholics of the British Isles kept as best they could, often without Mass, and with no external display, the great holydays of the Church. How many a soul yearned year after year for the happiness of joining once more in the holy sacrifice, and sanctifying the day of the Lord and the feasts of the Church, till, like the centenarian whom the Marquis of Worcester found during the Civil War, who had clung for eighty years to the true faith, when all around her were disloyal, but to whom the tidings that Mass was still said, and that she should be taken to a castle where she might hear it daily, was too much for her enfeebled frame. She died for joy that she was to hear Mass once more, to kneel in adoration at the solemn moment of consecration.

The Catholics of the British Isles, after the reform of Pope Urban VIII., kept as obligatory : Christmas, the feasts of St. Stephen, St. John, Holy Innocents and St. Sylvester, Circumcision, Epiphany, Candlemas, the feasts of St. Mathias and St. Joseph, Annunciation, Sts. Philip and James, Finding of the Holy Cross, St. John the Baptist, Sts. Peter and Paul, St. James, St. Anne, St. Lawrence, the Assumption, St. Bartholomew, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, St. Matthew, St. Michael, Sts. Simon and Jude, All Saints, St. Andrew, and St. Thomas, and one of the principal patrons of the city, province, or kingdom. These were the holydays of obligation observed by the Catholics in Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. But there, as in the British Isles, the observance of the law of the Church was not always an easy matter even for the most zealous. Where priests were so few and Mass often had to be said by stealth, few could actually hear Mass every holyday of obligation. In many cases private devotions at home were the only possible substitute by which they could attend in spirit the holy sacrifice offered on the altar of the Church. The numbers of Catholics who were held as bond servants of Protestants could not well escape working on those days. As some worked from necessity, others more careless and less scrupulous assumed the liberty of doing so likewise, though without justifiable reasons.

To remedy this, the Superior of the Mission, in 1722, laid the matter before the Confessor of the Faith, Bonaventure Giffard, Vicar Apostolic of London. The document premises that some step was necessary, as many Catholics took the liberty to work generally on holydays, because it was lawful in some cases of

necessity. As this was very disedifying, and might prove a great scandal to the more timorous, whose consciences would not allow them the same liberty, the bishop permitted hands to be employed where necessary in getting in crops on holydays occurring between May 1st and September 30th, except, however, Ascension, Whitsun-Monday, Corpus Christi, and Assumption, on which servile work was forbidden. All others not employed in getting in crops, were to observe all holydays by refraining from servile work, and all were required to hear Mass on every feast day of obligation. (Bishop Giffard's Regulation, December 21st, 1722).

These holydays thus regulated were observed by the oppressed Catholics of Maryland during the last century, when, in return for the liberty of worship they sought to establish, they were compelled to support a Protestant clergy, were excluded from office, deprived of the franchise, and loaded with double taxes.

At length, however, the Sovereign Pontiff, in view of the continuance of the persecuting spirit in England and America, for a cessation of which no prospect appeared, resolved to reduce the number of holydays of obligation there as elsewhere. Pius VI. accordingly, on the 9th of March, 1777, dispensed all Catholics in the kingdom of Great Britain from the precept of hearing Mass, and abstaining from servile works on all holydays except the Sundays of the year, the feasts of Christmas, Circumcision, Epiphany, Annunciation, Easter Monday, Ascension, Whitsun-Monday, Corpus Christi, St. Peter and St. Paul, Assumption, and All Saints.

These were the holydays of obligation at the time of the erection of this portion of the London vicariate into the diocese of Baltimore. The fasting days were the Ember days, the forty days of Lent, Wednesdays and Fridays in Advent, and the vigils of Christmas, Whitsun-Sunday, Sts. Peter and Paul, and All Saints.

There is nothing in the first Synod of Baltimore, held in 1791 by Bishop Carroll, promulgating these as the feasts and fasts of obligation in his diocese, which embraced the United States. The Indians in Maine and northern New York, and the Catholics in the territory northwest of the Ohio, had been under the See of Quebec, and the question was raised whether the diocese of Baltimore included the thirteen States, or all the territory recognized by other nations, as belonging to the government known as the United States. The Holy See decided that the diocese had the same limits as the national territory, but, in point of fact, Detroit and other points in the West were held by England till the signing of Jay's treaty, and the Bishop of Quebec addressed the Catholics of Detroit as part of his flock.

When, however, the jurisdiction of Baltimore was recognized

throughout the country, the holydays and fasts observed in the East seemed to have been adopted in all the West.

Louisiana, with the country west of the Mississippi, which had been part of the diocese of Quebec, was ceded by France to Spain in 1763. About thirteen years subsequently, the Bishop of Santiago de Cuba, who had always regarded Florida as part of his diocese, extended his jurisdiction over Louisiana. There is no trace of any decree at Rome, or at Quebec, by which this was formally detached from the diocese of Quebec, and the Bishop of Santiago de Cuba seems to have acted under the direction of the Spanish court, claiming the territory as the part of ancient Florida traversed by De Soto. At all events, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, feasts and fasts recognized in Cuba and Florida, were observed more or less faithfully in Louisiana, under the Bishops of Cuba, till 1787, when, with Florida, it became part of the new diocese of Louisiana and the Floridas. Bishop Peñalver, the first bishop, made no new regulation that is known, and the feasts and fasts continued unaltered till the commencement of the nineteenth century.

Bonaparte, with Spain humbled before him, felt that the honor of France required the recovery of Louisiana, which, French in origin, French in feeling, had been for years under Spanish domination. In 1801 Spain agreed to cede it upon certain conditions and contingencies. Bonaparte found, however, that England with a fleet in the Gulf of Mexico could at any time wrest it from France. The United States, hampered by Spanish regulations, which denied vessels descending the Mississippi the privilege of obtaining water and provisions, was compelled at last to open negotiations with the First Consul for the territory. Napoleon, seeing that he could not hold Louisiana, was not reluctant to transfer it to a friendly power, who could prevent England from acquiring it. A treaty, signed April 30th, 1803, transferred the colony to the United States. "I can scarcely say that I cede it to them," said Napoleon, "for it is not yet in our possession." The *jus dominii* had thus been twice transferred, though the Spanish flag continued to float over Louisiana, and the colony was still governed by Spanish civil and ecclesiastical law.

By the treaty of April 30th, 1803, France parted with the *jus dominii*, without having ever acquired possession. It remained only for Spain to make the formal delivery to France, that France might transfer it to the United States. "On the 6th of June, 1803, the First Consul had appointed Laussat, commissioner on the part of France, to receive possession of the province of Louisiana, and deliver it to the commissioners to be appointed on behalf of the United States. On the 30th of November the keys of New Orleans

were handed to Laussat, who was put in possession of Louisiana and its dependencies. On the 20th of December Laussat proclaimed the delivery of the province to the United States and handed the keys of the city of New Orleans to Clayborne, the commissioner of the United States.

Now the reader may wonder what all this has to do with the feasts and fasts of the Catholic Church, and he may think that, if

Aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus,

the writer, over-given to historical disquisition, has let his mind go wool-gathering, and that he has actually forgotten the subject which he set out to discuss. Yet it all has a bearing, and was necessary to explain a curious question that arose, or, rather, a course of action adopted without question.

On the 5th of April, 1802, a Concordat was signed between Napoleon Bonaparte, First Consul of France, and Pope Pius VII., by one of the provisions of which the holydays of obligation to be observed in France were reduced to Christmas, Ascension, Assumption, and All Saints. In France the Revolution had swept away all ecclesiastical and religious institutions, and Bonaparte was afraid of venturing too far, or of asking the infidel party to accept too much. Yet it was held in Louisiana that the temporary tenure of the province by France for twenty days, without any *jus dominii*, but merely to effect a formal transfer to the United States, brought Louisiana, where religion had suffered nothing from the revolutionary spirit of France, within the action of the Concordat and the Organic Articles published by Bonaparte with it. The ground seems utterly untenable. Bonaparte never seems to have regarded it so. He made no nomination to the vacant bishopric of Louisiana, as he might have done under the Concordat, had he deemed it to apply; none of the rights of the Church or of the Ursuline Convent were at all invaded under color of French law from the Spanish cession of 1801 to 1803. Yet untenable as the proposition seems to have been legally, it is nevertheless certain that from that time no holydays of obligation except those four were observed in Louisiana, which then embraced all the territory west of the Mississippi, and in which in time were formed the dioceses of St. Louis, Little Rock, Dubuque, St. Paul, Natchitoches, Kansas City, St. Joseph, Davenport, Leavenworth, Omaha, and several vicariates.

The case was, apparently, not referred to Rome for any decision or opinion, for Cardinal Litta wrote to Archbishop Marechal on the 11th of July, 1818, to ascertain on what ground the faithful in Louisiana did not observe fast days that were of obligation in other

parts of the United States. It is stated, however, in the statutes of the Diocese of St. Louis, set forth by Bishop Rosati, in 1839, that the reduction of the holydays was then established by a concession of the Holy See, and it was enjoined to celebrate with solemnity the feasts of the Circumcision, Epiphany, Annunciation, Corpus Christi, Sts. Peter and Paul, the Nativity and Conception of the Blessed Virgin, as well as Easter Monday and Whitsun-Monday. (Statute 1839, p. 20; Roman edn., p. 183.)

By a still stranger course of reasoning, this Concordat was assumed by some, who must have been very ill-informed on American history, to extend to the territory, now the States, of Mississippi, Indiana, and Illinois. This territory, east of the Mississippi River, had been in the hands of England from 1763 to 1776, and of the United States after that, except the southern part of the present State of Mississippi, which was embraced in the Spanish province of West Florida. None of these parts were in Louisiana as transferred by Spain to France, and by France to the United States. With the exception of a small Spanish strip, it had been under the English and American flags for forty years, and could not in the remotest degree be affected by a Concordat between the First Consul of France, or the Emperor of China, and the Pope. Yet in some mysterious way this Concordat was considered to affect territory of the United States, to which France under Louis XVI., the Terror, the Republic and the Consulate, had not made the slightest claim or pretence. However, these holydays only were kept in the dioceses of Chicago, Vincennes,¹ and Mobile.

When Florida was purchased in 1821, no such question arose. The old holydays were maintained. The same was the case in Texas on its annexation, and in the territory acquired by the United States after the Mexican war.²

But the due observance of holydays, whether few or many, was a subject of concern. The Synod of 1791 says: "Catholics, especially tradesfolk and artisans of every kind, who live in towns, cannot, without great inconvenience, abstain from selling goods or work on those holydays which are not observed also by Protestants. Whence there is reason to fear that if this is rigorously exacted,

¹ They were kept in Indiana during the administration of Bishop de la Hailandiere, who so established them in a synod (Syn. Vincenn., I., 1844), but the former usage of celebrating the other feasts has since been observed, the Holy See having, at the request of the Second Council of Cincinnati, issued a rescript making the Circumcision, Epiphany, Corpus Christi and Annunciation of obligation. (Conc. Cincin., II., p. 18.)

² The feasts of obligation in New Mexico, as fixed by the *Constituciones Ecclesiasticas de Santa Fé*, 1874, p. 29, were the Sundays, Circumcision, Epiphany, Annunciation, Ascension, Corpus Christi, Assumption, All Saints, Immaculate Conception, and Christmas.

there will be some who will imperil their eternal salvation rather than incur such temporal losses. To meet this difficulty, therefore, we ordain that every one should consult his pastor and abide by his judgment in the matter. And we warn our venerable brethren that when grave cause exists, they may dispense with their observance of the holydays, retaining, however, the obligation to hear Mass, if more than one is said in the place where the dispensation is given, or if they can hear that one without serious loss." (Synodus Baltimore, ann. 1791, § 20.)

The history of the various holydays observed as of obligation in the different parts of the country at different times is not without a degree of interest. When a work appeared which professed to treat *ex professo* of the ecclesiastical law in the United States, the writer not unnaturally looked for a full and clear treatment of that subject, as well as of tithes, in that work. Of tithes nothing was said; of the holydays of obligation a few words, and not extremely accurate, drawn from the common Catholic annual directory, seemed to exhaust the subject; but a more extended use of the work resulted in the conviction that it was merely a translation of a French work, entirely dispensing with a study of what had been regarded as ecclesiastical law in the three great divisions of the country in earlier times.¹

At the time of the first Plenary Council of Baltimore, the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide urged that the feast of the Circumcision should be made of obligation throughout the country, and the feast of the Immaculate Conception, which had been adopted as the patronal feast of the United States, should be made of obligation.²

The first Provincial Council of New Orleans manifested a reluctance to attempt to enforce these (Conc. Neo. Aurel. I., p. 20), and the Holy See was urged to permit the obligation of hearing Mass and resting from servile works to be restricted to the four great feasts. The Sovereign Pontiff, however, through Cardinal Barnabo, in 1816, exhorted the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council not to seek uniformity in points where relaxed discipline had removed the practice in the American dioceses far from the usual and general discipline of the Church, but to endeavor to lead

¹ Additional probability is given to the supposition, from the fact that the author of the work in question appropriated, and issued as his own, a compilation prepared by the present writer. If this article is taken, as one on the Douay Bible was taken by a seminary professor, it is to be hoped that it will be more thoroughly revised than his work in the other cases.

² Pittsburg (Dioc. Syn., 1844) and Sault St. Mary, in the Statuta Diœc. Marianap., 1872, p. 7, urged all the faithful to sanctify this feast by hearing Mass; and the V. Syn. Philadel. directed that a novena or triduum should precede the feast.

the faithful gradually back from the relaxed discipline to the paths of that generally observed.

In the Second Plenary Council (1866) the feast of the Immaculate Conception was made of obligation,¹ as it had been in Oregon (I Concil. Oregon, 1848), where the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul had retained its place with the Monday after Easter and Whit-Sunday, St. John the Baptist, Candlemas, and St. Stephen.

Pope Gregory XVI., in 1837, dispensed all the dioceses then in the United States from the obligation as to Easter Monday and Whitsun-Monday, and in 1840 from that of the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul; and the same Sovereign Pontiff relieved the faithful from the fast on Wednesdays in Advent. (III. Concil. Prov. Balt., pp. 148, 150, 187.)

This was the position of the discipline in this country when the Third Penary Council was convened. The effort to induce the faithful to a more exact observance of holydays of obligation, or at least so far as hearing mass was concerned, had not been successful. A general indifference prevailed. When zealous priests, to give servants and mechanics every opportunity to fulfil the obligation, had Mass celebrated at an early hour, to permit them to attend it before proceeding to their usual work, it was found that almost the only persons to avail themselves of the opportunity would be a few pious old women, while those of the very class for whose benefit the Mass was thus offered were scarcely represented by a few straggling individuals.

The Fathers of the Council renewed their petition to the Holy See, and His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII., on the 31st of December, 1885, transferred the solemnization of Corpus Christi to the Sunday following the feast, and made the holydays of obligation in all parts of the United States to be thenceforward: The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, Christmas Day, the feast of the Circumcision, Ascension Day, the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, and the feast of All Saints. (III. Conc. Balt. Plen., pp. cvi., 57.)

Thus, for the first time, a uniform discipline prevails throughout the United States; Louisiana and the dioceses formed from it adopted the feasts of the Circumcision and the Immaculate Conception; New Mexico, California, and Oregon, and the rest of the United States, no longer are bound by the obligation to hear Mass and abstain from servile works on the Epiphany, the Annunciation, and Corpus Christi.

Thus gradually the original scheme of the Church has been swept away by increasing tepidity. The feasts of the Apostles are

¹ The holydays as then appointed are given formally in *Acta Dioc. Roffensis*, p. 26; *Constit. Dioc. Boston*, 1868, p. 21.

gone, the many feasts of our Lord are reduced to three, of our Lady to two, and of the Saints the one single festival of All Saints remains.

There was a time when the holydays of the Church were the godsend of the poor toilers for bread; a time when the churches of the living God were lived in by the poor, to whom they were homes, houses of prayer, galleries of art, incentives to devotion. Time, in the sense of the Church, is a respite, a reprieve given to men to save their souls; time, in the sense of the modern world, is a term when the many are to labor to enrich the few; a term so precious that none of it can be spared for the many to save their souls.

The long line of festivals has been suppressed. Who has gained by it? The French Revolution seized and used all the property of the Church and the nobles. The poor were to be raised from their abject misery. By work and toil they were to acquire competence. After a century of trial the working class in France are desperate anarchists, clamoring again for a seizure of property from those who hold it. Spain seized the Church property, and has its discontented thousands; Italy did the same, and drives her people into exile as immigrants to foreign lands. The gospel of work is now rejected by the poor. They have had too much of it. They clamor for fewer hours of work, for more holydays, for higher wages. The time and money they extort by combinations, have no blessing; both are spent in sensual indulgence. Their families do not gain by them, but saloon-keepers are enriched.

These extorted holydays given by the nineteenth century do nothing to elevate or improve the masses. As a mere matter of political economy, it may be asked whether the old time Catholic worker, who had twenty religious holydays, and spent much of them in ennobling and piety-inspiring shrines, was not happier in himself, more prosperous in his home, a more valuable element in the body politic, than his modern representative?

DESCARTES' POSTULATE OF EXISTENCE.

AT the very beginning of philosophical reasoning we are met by the impossibility of finding in a single formal expression any statement that does not beg the question of existence. The basis, in order to satisfy even the skeptic, must evidently not only not beg, through its terms, the question involved, but must not, to the mass of mankind, seem to beg it. The difficulty, if not impossibility, of the task dawns at the first glance, even from the preceding brief remark, made without intention of attempting in that connection to define a criterion such as would form a basis for reasoning. For if we say, as above, "evidently," we directly assert that there is such a thing as conclusive evidence. We thereby assume the existence of a fundamental criterion or of fundamental criteria; for the at least assumed existence of such criterion or criteria is necessary to the formal validity of any evidence whatever, and to the establishment of any position however near or remote.

The existence of such a criterion or of such criteria was, therefore, begged here in a statement intended solely to introduce the discussion of the question of the possibility of defining in set terms the humanly fundamental fact—existence. It is unavoidable, however, that in the approach to this or any other subject, the question of the existence of such criteria should be begged. Otherwise, we could not reach consideration of any subject at all. It is an unavoidable case of *ὑστερον πρότερον*. But, having once reached a subject, not fundamental, through a preliminary artifice which has placed us face to face with it, the artifice is not either retained or discarded; it simply lapses, perforce of its having no immediately intimate relation to the subject. Otherwise, if, for example, we demanded formal ratiocinative evidence of existence, the conduct of life would be impossible. For the daily needs of life we must assume existence as proved; not as provable, but as a certainty beyond all formal proof.

That we reach the entrance to many truths through fictions of our own creation and fashioning, it is hardly worth while to pause long in order to demonstrate. John Stuart Mill, in opposition to Whewell, has contended that the definitions and the axioms of geometry are derived, not from intuitions, but from experience; both being, for the purpose for which they are designed, ideally

amplified through divestment of non-essentials.¹ A line, for example, which, mathematically, is said to have length without breadth or thickness, is nothing but the line of our experience, having length, breadth, and thickness; but, by a fiction, to the truth of which we formally assent, for the sake of reaching a basis for the discovery of mathematical truth, it is mentally, although not conceivably, divested of characteristics non-essential to the purpose in view. Mill's demonstration regarding axioms, although properly long and elaborate, would be lengthy here, and therefore must be passed by without illustration, which, without the demonstration, would not be comprehensible. Perhaps the most correct statement would be that these conceptions are given in intuition, mediately through experience. It may well be questioned whether they are purely intuitive or purely experiential. To affirm of them that they are mixed in their derivation is, however, merely to say that they are given in a teaching of experience appreciable through the constitution of the mind. Being at once apprehended, they give the impression of being purely intuitive, when, probably, experience is a necessary factor to their determination. Certain it is that not until emergence from the child characteristics of mind, a variable point of time in human development, is there appreciation of what is regarded as their axiomatic truth; which would seem to substantiate the view here expressed.

That there are fundamental criteria upon which the validity of reasoning must rest, is the conviction of the mass of mankind. They find themselves, and see all men, conducting themselves as if in assured possession of criteria for forming judgments. It follows that whatever men may use for the ordinary needs of life must, in reference to their constitution, be based on fundamental criteria that collectively embrace the whole of life. Moreover, it is the conviction of the great majority of that portion of mankind which philosophizes, that there are various criteria, resolvable into one fundamental criterion; that whoever says one criterion, says God. Among these criteria is the generally admitted principle of contradiction, which affirms that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time. There are other principles, but it would lead us far, and entirely away from our purpose, to enter upon discussion of them here. The demonstration to be here made relates solely to the assertion that fundamental criteria are formally inexpressible without begging the question; in proof whereof it will be shown that the question of existence itself cannot, without begging it, be formally stated. If it, itself, cannot, without begging the question, be formally stated, it cannot form

¹ Chapter V. of J. S. Mill's *Logic*, Eighth Edition. Harper & Brother, New York City.

other than an assumed basis for the establishment of any question within the confines of existence as at present generally and practically believed to exist.

Even with regard to the principle of contradiction, which to the mass of mankind seems indisputable, the skeptic might not be at a loss for a reply. He might say that the formulation of the principle begs the question of our own existence; for we have not proved that we exist, as the mere unaided, unreasoning sense of existence tells us that we exist. This being true, it would be easy for him to proceed a step further, and say that, if we cannot prove that even we ourselves exist, we cannot know it, and therefore cannot be justified in asserting that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time. What shall we think? Only that, as pure negation is the easiest wisdom in the trifles of life, it cannot fail to be the most impregnable in what concerns the very essence of life. But, how should we answer the skeptic? There is no answer derivable from the expression of a single ratiocinative principle. That is what we are about to essay to prove. We are forced, according to our conviction, to admit that the affirmation of any principle of existence begs the question of existence; that no formal expression relating to it can be devised without begging the question of existence. Therefore, if this be true, the most fundamental of all human postulates, whether expressed or implied, begs existence; as, without begging the question of existence, we cannot define it, we cannot base upon it any criterion without equally begging the question. This is not, as already intimated, to assert that existence is necessarily indefinable. Millions of human beings now living, and many more millions who have passed away, have mentally defined it, and have lived in the certainty of its correct definition. Wherein, then, lies the impossibility of defining it in the set terms of a single expression? It lies in the fact that it is, in the intellectual order, beyond any set terms of speech. Speech, even in its highest range, is the medium of the commonplace, compared with thought to be expressed that is the middle term between God and man. Even the human mind, incomparably superior in conception to its power of expression by speech, is only the portal through which we penetrate to, but not into, the temple wherein is enshrined the mystery of mysteries.

The subject before us, at present, concerns strictly the possibility of making any formal proposition regarding existence that does not either beg, or seem to the mass of mankind to beg, the question involved. We might assume, hypothetically, that a proposition might be framed which does not beg the question, and yet, which would seem to mankind generally to beg it. In that case, the fact of the proposition not begging the question would depend

upon the relative intelligence of a small minority. Effectively, if, to the general lower intelligence, the question seemed to be begged, it would be begged. The problem, therefore, set before the dialectician, in attempting to formulate in language this fundamental postulate of reasoning, is, as has been said, so to phrase it that it shall not seem to mankind generally to beg it. There is no lesser test that would make sure that it has been correctly framed. Attempting the solution of this problem, he will have set before himself an impossible task; for neither it, nor, in consequence, any other proposition can, without begging the question of existence, be formulated, either for mankind generally, or for the choicest band of philosophers.

Here, in this case, no artifice is possible to enable us to place ourselves upon a foundation as the very first indispensable condition to making a step in advance. The question is not of what we individually believe to be true, but of what we shall stand ready to prove to others to be true. Back of that, of course, necessarily, the question is of what we shall stand ready to prove to ourselves. Our own personal belief being what it is,—in the value of certain cognitions from intuition, and in one fundamental truth, God,—we are yet forced to confess to ourselves that belief in human existence is not, without begging the question, statable in one formal proposition, or in any number of formal propositions. Although, of the existence of fundamental criteria, derived from one primeval criterion, we are incidentally endeavoring to express our firm conviction, we are not, however, directing special attention to our own conviction, or to the processes by which it has been reached, but are speaking to the point of the possibility of so defining fundamental criteria that their truth shall be universally recognized by intelligent men. There is no possibility of it. Referring to one primeval criterion, its existence is disputed. Referring to existence, its existence is disputed. These we may affirm to exist, but how shall we prove them to exist? Only by the formulation of a proposition which shall not beg the question involved. That proposition we cannot formulate, and, therefore, these propositions are insusceptible of proof of the ratiocinative kind contained in language. It does not follow that they are insusceptible of comprehension of the mental kind, apart from the formal propositions of language.

How can we possibly frame in language any proposition upon the truth of which all human criteria, if such exist, must rest, when there are men who doubt the existence of existence? We have, logically, no more right to say, "I think, therefore I exist," than we have the right to say, "I exist, therefore I think." If one say, with Descartes, "I think, therefore I am," the answer is ready, that

the affirmation of the "I think" is assuming existence to exist, the thing to be proved. If so, and we must admit that it is so, then the statement is, "the existence thinks, therefore exists." But, if existence be assumed, there is no necessity for the predication, "thinks." It has no relevancy as a factor towards the conclusion; which is simply the statement that existence exists, which is not fruitful; for, evidently, existence exists, if it exists, and does not exist, if it does not exist. Descartes has defended his proposition, but examination of the passages wherein he has attempted to justify it will prove, we think, that he has not done so triumphantly.¹

Kant says: "I should have a reasonable hope of putting an end forever to this sophistical mode of argumentation, by a strict definition of the conception of existence, did not my own experience teach me that the illusion arising from our confounding a logical with a real predicate (a predicate which aids in the determination of a thing) resists almost all the endeavors of explanation and illustration. A *logical predicate* may be what you please, even the subject may be predicated of itself; for logic pays no regard to the contents of a judgment. But the determination of a conception is a predicate, which adds to and enlarges the conception. It must not, therefore, be contained in the conception."²

The principle of Descartes has been often assailed. The latest denial of its truth with which we have met is that of Dr. Henry Maudsley, who, although speaking from the lowest depth of pessimism, and presenting the strange spectacle of an accomplished metaphysician ridiculing metaphysics, without which he could not write at all on the topics of which he habitually treats, is, nevertheless, an unusually able, philosophical, and even powerful writer.³ He says: "*Cogito, ergo sum*, 'I think, therefore I am,' has a ring of transcendental authority, until we interpolate after 'I' the quietly suppressed, but none the less surreptitiously understood, 'who am,' and let it read, as it should read, thus,—'I [who am] think, there-

¹ Renati Des Cartes ad C. L. R. Epistola: In qua ad epitomen præcipuarum Petri Gassendi, Instantiarum respondetur. Meditationes de Prima Philosophia, cum Responsibus Auctoris. Editi ultima prioribus auctor et emendati. Amstelodami. Apud Danielem Elzevirium. MDCLXXVIII.

² Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, pp. 367 and 368. Bohn's Philosophical Library.

³ Yet, although anomalous, this intellectual phase is not only not unprecedented, but is not uncommon, as we learn from Kant, who says with respect to it: "For it is in reality vain to profess *indifference* in regard to such inquiries, the object of which cannot be indifferent to humanity. Besides, these pretended *indifferentists*, however much they may try to disguise themselves by the assumption of a popular style, and by changes on the language of the schools, unavoidably fall into metaphysical declarations and propositions, which they profess to regard with so much contempt." Page second of the Preface to the first edition of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. Bohn's Philosophical Library.

fore I am;' after which it does not appear to carry us beyond the simple and subjectively irreducible fact of consciousness, beneath which, it must not be forgotten, there is in all cases the more fundamental fact of an organism that is *one*.¹

Is Dr. Maudsley right? We think that he is, so far as exhibiting the imperfection of the principle as attempted to be formulated. It seems extraordinary that any one could ever have disputed the correctness of the position he assumes. But, as stated before, our contention is that it is only the formulation that is defective; that the defect is inherent, not in the truth attempted to be formulated, but in the formulation of it.

Let us approach the subject gradually, with a torch lent us by one of the most subtle thinkers of modern times, the Spanish writer, Balmez. He says, in discussing this principle of Descartes: "The famous principle of Descartes, 'I think, therefore I am,' has been often attacked, and justly and conclusively so, if this philosopher really understood his principle in the sense which the schools are accustomed to give it. If Descartes presented it as a true argument, as an enthymema, with an antecedent and a consequent, the argument was clearly defective in its foundation. For, when he said, 'I am going to prove my existence with this enthymema, I think, therefore I am,' the objection might have been made: your enthymema is equivalent to a syllogism in this form: 'whatever thinks, exists; but I think, therefore I exist.' This syllogism, in the supposition of universal doubt, excluding even the supposition of existence itself, is inadmissible in its propositions and in their connection. In the first place, how do you know that whatever thinks exists? Because [you answer] nothing can think without existing. How do you know that? Because [you say] what does not exist, does not act. But how, in its turn, do you know this? Supposing every thing to be doubted, nothing to be known, these principles are not known; otherwise we fall short of the supposition of universal doubt, and consequently go out of the question. If any one of these principles must be admitted without proof, it is just as well to admit your own existence and save yourself the trouble of proving it with an enthymema.

"In the second place, how do you know that you think? Your argument may be retorted, as dialecticians say, in the following manner: 'Nothing can think without existing; but your existence is doubtful, for you are trying to prove it; therefore you are not sure that you think.'

"Manifestly, then, Descartes' principle, taken as a true argument, cannot be defended; and it is so easy to see the defect that it

¹ Body and Will, by Henry Maudsley, M.D., page 37. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., No. 1 Paternoster Square, London.

seems impossible for so clear and penetrating an intellect to have overlooked it. It is, therefore, probable that Descartes understood his principle in a very different sense; and we will now briefly show what meaning, in our judgment, the illustrious philosopher must have given to it.

"Supposing himself for a moment in universal doubt, without accepting for certain anything that is known, he concentrated himself on himself, and in the depth of his soul sought a point whereon to base the edifice of human cognitions. Although we abstract all around us, we clearly cannot abstract ourselves, our mind, which is present to our own eyes, only the more lucidly the greater the abstraction in which we place ourselves with respect to external objects. Now, in this concentration, this collection of himself within himself, this withdrawal from everything, for fear of error, and asking himself if there be anything certain, if there be any foundation and starting-point in the career of knowledge; first of all is presented to him the consciousness of thought, the very presence of the acts of his mind. If we mistake not, this was Descartes' thought: 'I wish to doubt of everything; I refrain from affirming as from denying anything; I isolate myself from whatever surrounds me, because I know not if it be anything more than an illusion. But, in this very isolation, I meet with the intimate sense of my internal acts, with the presence of my mind; *I think, therefore I am*; this I feel in a manner that leaves no room for doubt or uncertainty; *therefore I am*; that is to say, this sense of my thought makes me know my existence.'

"This explains why Descartes did not present his principle as a mere enthymema, as an ordinary argument, but as determining a fact presented to him, and first in the order of facts; even if he inferred existence from thought, it was not by deduction, properly so called, but as one fact contained in another, or rather identified with it.

"We say *identified*, because it really is so in Descartes' opinion; and this confirms what we have already advanced, that this philosopher did not offer an argument, but laid down a fact. According to him, the essence of the soul consists in thought; and as other schools of philosophy distinguish between substance and its acts, considering the mind in the first class, and thought in the second, so Descartes held that there was no distinction between mind and thought, that they were the same thing, that thought constituted the essence of the soul. 'Although one attribute,' he says, 'suffices to make us know the substance, there is, nevertheless, in every substance one attribute, which constitutes its nature and essence, and on which all the others depend. Extension in length, breadth, and thickness constitutes the essence of corporeal substance; and

thought constitutes the nature of the substance which thinks.' From this it follows that Descartes, in laying down the principle, 'I think, therefore I exist,' only declared a fact attested by consciousness; and so simple did he consider it, and so unique, that in evolving his system, he identified thought with the soul, and its essence with its existence. He was conscious of thought, and said: 'This thought is my soul; I am.'"¹

Thus speaks Balmez, whom we have quoted at length, lest a partial quotation might do injustice to his exposition. We cannot see how he has in the least mended matters by his final enunciation of the principle; what he has, in our opinion, accomplished, we will presently describe. If the idea of Descartes was really as interpreted by Balmez, it was nothing, as to fact and expression, but that common to all men. It merely assumes what, at first, all men naturally assume as truth through intuition, through self-consciousness; the correctness of which no one can formally prove or disprove.

Speaking now solely with reference to the formulation of Descartes' idea by Balmez, according to his interpretation of it, "this thought is my soul; I am;" we would say that, in our opinion, there is no avoidance of begging the question. "This thought is," says Balmez. What thought? Really Descartes' thought; and therefore the expression is equivalent to, "I [Descartes] think." What remains is only "I am;" for Balmez has told us what, in fact, is so, that Descartes held thought and soul to be one. The analysis, therefore, stands thus: "I [Descartes] think; I am." That reduces the expression to exactly what it was before, according to Descartes, because the word "therefore" is grammatically understood. This, then, is Balmez' complete expression, as analyzed, exhibiting the fact that he does not, any more than Descartes, avoid begging the question: "This thought is my soul [I think]; [therefore] I am."

Dr. Maudsley² might say, for he has said in his work, "Body and Will," that "it has never yet been shown, though it is freely assumed, that consciousness is not the function of a particular bodily structure." Neither, we may say in reply, has it yet been proved that consciousness *is* the function of a particular bodily structure, although it is in a fair way to be at length acknowledged as assumed by a certain school of physiologists, that it is naught but that. We can afford to leave Dr. Maudsley's statement out of

¹ Chapter XVII., pp. 108, 109, 110 of *Fundamental Philosophy*, by James Balmez. Translated from the Spanish by Henry F. Brownson, M.A. D. & J. Sadlier & Co., No. 31 Barclay Street, New York City.

² *Body and Will*, by Henry Maudsley, M.D., page 38. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. No. 1 Paternoster Square, London.

consideration, inasmuch as this discussion is proceeding on lines of implication incompatible with its formal introduction at this point. As to his objection, it is well, however, to note here, in passing, that it doubly begs the question of existence, by implying existence as material.

To sum up what Balmez seems to us to say: He begins by asserting that, according to his view, the expression by Descartes of his principle was probably at variance with his conception of it; that, whereas, he evidently intended to enunciate his principle as the expression of a fact, he had given to it the form of an argument. Taking this as his point of departure, Balmez then defines what he thinks Descartes intended to enunciate. But, in so doing, he gives nothing, as the idea of Descartes, beyond what is the common conception and expression of the commonly accepted cognition as derived from intuition; and besides, in attempting to state it as a fact, to the avoidance of its appearance as an argument, he has presented, as to form, an argument exactly like that of Descartes, only couched in different words; for it ought to be evident that the expression of Balmez, "this thought is my soul, I am," is equivalent to the expression of Descartes, "I think, therefore I am." Both have the form of arguments. Both, if to be interpreted as statement of fact, not argument, do not go beyond the general expression of the general cognition through intuition.

It is a strange thing to say, and we wish to say it without the slightest intention of disparaging Balmez, for whom we have the sincerest admiration, that in this particular case he has, while elaborately attempting to elucidate the view of Descartes, as formulated in his celebrated proposition, failed in a measure to relieve it from its original obscurity. And this is all the more strange because, in a mere note which he appends to his "Fundamental Philosophy" he gives, from Descartes himself, the only explanation, of all that he made of which we know, that is satisfactory. In support of this statement we quote from the notes to book first of "Fundamental Philosophy," as translated by Mr. Henry F. Brownson, the following passage.

"We have, we think, faithfully interpreted the thought of Descartes, but lest there should be some doubt as to this, we subjoin a notable passage from his answer to the objections collected by Père Mersenne from various philosophers and theologians, against the second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth meditations.

"'When we know that we are something that thinks, this first notion is taken from no syllogisms; and when any one says: *I think, therefore I am*, or exist, he does not infer his existence from thought, as by the force of a syllogism, but as a thing known by itself; he sees it by a simple inspection of the mind; for if he deduced it from a syl-

logism, he would have to know beforehand this major: whatever thinks is, or exists. On the contrary, this proposition is manifested to him by his own sentiment that he cannot think without existing. It is a property characteristic of our mind to form general propositions from the knowledge of particular propositions.' Descartes does not always explain himself with this clearness; the objections of his adversaries made him examine his doctrine more thoroughly, and this contributed to clear up his ideas."

But then, this comes to what we have from the first asserted, that no proposition can be framed which shall prove the fact of existence. Here Descartes impliedly admits it, for he shows that what bears the form of an argument—the very framework of his celebrated proposition—is no argument at all, that it was not by him intended, and cannot properly be understood, as such. Here, as Descartes admits it, we rest our case with this conclusion, in which we have the honor to agree with both him and Balmez, that it is impossible to make an argument for, without begging the question of, existence; which is what was to be demonstrated.

It is not intended as disparagement of the judgment of mankind as to the principle attempted to be enunciated by Descartes and Balmez, to say that the principle does not, through their enunciation, rise above the common conception and expression of the principle by mankind generally. It is safe to say, what has all along been here implied, what it would be madness to doubt, that the understanding, through perception or imperception, of the intelligent of mankind generally, must be the final test of the truth of any principle whatsoever, and that equally (as inseparably bound up with their perception or imperception) to that test must be the final appeal as to the correctness or incorrectness of the formulation of the principle with respect to its representation in words. Philosophers cannot in any wise go beyond the perception of the intelligent of mankind generally, in the comprehension of a principle that relates to mankind, or in the perception of the truth or falsity of the principle as formulated in words. It is only in the sphere of the first conception and formulation of principles that philosophers can excel the intelligent of mankind generally. The final test of the truth of the principles, and of their correct expression, must reside with mankind. Assuming this position as incontrovertible, then we repeat that neither Descartes nor Balmez has formulated the principle evidently intended to be formulated, in a manner essentially different from each other, or from that in which it is formulated by the intelligent of mankind generally.

Yet, withal, there is a something indefinable in the expression of Balmez, not contained in the expression of Descartes, which, as an attempted statement of what it is obvious that each attempts to

state, approaches much more nearly to the truth of statement, as such, without regard to whether the thing attempted to be stated be or be not true, than the expression of Descartes comes. But more, far more, than from the expression into which Balmez finally resolves the conception (which, formally, is as faulty as that of Descartes) does light break upon us from the exposition of both in the expansion of their theme; which both have marred by their attempted condensation of it in a single phrase.

It does not follow that, if the principle of Descartes and Balmez, assuming it to exist, could be enunciated without begging the question of existence, it would, while substantially in its present form, command general assent, for it must not be forgotten that a certain school tells us that consciousness may be entirely a bodily function,—that is, not spirit. This implies that spirit, if it exists, may not be able to recognize its own essence, and, therefore, that spirit is perhaps non-existent. The objection we note in passing, as an insuperable barrier of negation, and should like to proceed with the heretofore continuous assumption that, if human life means any endowment, it means endowment of spirit. It comes to this, however, that if we would not attempt to formulate an expression that would be taken exception to by the materialist, as begging the question of spirit as well as of existence, we must (provisory, at least, and under protest) substitute for spirit consciousness, which even the materialist does not deny. It will not do, then, to say with Balmez, "this thought is my soul, I am;" we are driven to say, "this self-consciousness is this self-existence," and "this consciousness of mankind is the existence of mankind;" for this, which is true of one man, is true of all men, as they have ascertained by comparison of individual consciousnesses. Therefore, broadly, for all mankind, consciousness is existence. These are irrefutable propositions. Even the materialist, as stated above, recognizes the fact of consciousness. It affirms and establishes, through individual consciousness, and through comparison with other consciousnesses, not only the fact of its existence, but the quality of its existence, in universal similar consciousness. If it does undeniably affirm the general fact of its existence, why is not what it affirms of the attributes of its existence equally undeniable? This, however, in passing. Admit that consciousness is an unknown quantity, or, rather, quality. Then this unknown quality is existence. Self-consciousness pervades even sleep. With the end of self-consciousness is generally a blank. We beg no question, then, when we say that human consciousness is human existence, whatever consciousness may be, and whatever existence may be.

The difficulty under which we all labor as to the fullest comprehension of the principle under discussion, is in the seemingly im-

possible elimination of the determining *ego* from our knowledge. Descartes includes the *ego*, at least formally, when he says: "I think; therefore I am." Balmez includes it, at least formally, when he uses the expression, "this thought," in the phrase, "this thought is my soul; I am." All mankind formally include it, and must continue formally to include it, whenever they attempt to enunciate the principle of Descartes.

The question, however, arises, whether the *ego* may not at times be eliminated from self-consciousness, as an influence controlling to wrong conclusions. To put it concretely, the question arises whether many of mankind, knowing the *ego* to be at most times self-prominent, so to speak, may not incorrectly believe it to be always so present, in the form prejudicial to sound conclusion regarding itself, and may not, therefore, unjustly suspect it of rendering such conclusion at all times impossible.

Supposing that a man were able to divest himself of the idea of the *ego*, to eliminate the *ego* entirely, in the fullest sense of his not knowing of its presence in his conception, and in his deliverance in speech, its presence would still be asserted by other men, and his deliverance be contested. As he could not indicate his conception of existence by any other than some such expression as, "I think," or "my thought," he is always open to the charge of begging, both mentally and verbally, the question attempted to be enunciated in the principle of Descartes.

The question remains (and the remarks of Balmez throw a flood of light in the right direction), whether the *ego*, in the sense of the presence of one's own individuality, as neutralizing a conception involving the affirmation of existence, may not at times be eliminated. Still would remain, however, the impossibility of formally expressing in any present terms of speech the virtual absence of the *ego*.

This consideration leads, as the natural preliminary starting-point, to the investigation and definition of that which we conceive to be the *ego*. Upon close scrutiny it will be found that we apprehend the term as representing two distinct phases of self-consciousness. We understand the term as referring both abstractly and concretely to self-consciousness. We understand the *ego* in the sense opposed to the abstract *non-ego*. We also understand the *ego* in the sense of its individuality, with reference to Brown, Jones, or Robinson.¹

Is it not within the bounds of experience that the abstract *ego*

¹ Kant remarks: "The simple, in abstraction, is very different from the objectively simple; and hence the *ego*, which is simple in the first sense, may, in the second sense, as indicating the soul itself, be a very complex conception, with a very various content. Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, pp. 476, 477. Bohn's Philosophical Library.

is capable of acts different in kind from those of which the concrete *ego* is capable? There is reason to believe that it is. As Brown, Jones, and Robinson, the concrete *ego* is not, for instance, prompted to enter upon and pursue such speculations as these; it is content to know of its identity with Brown, Jones, and Robinson, as contradistinguished from Johnson and Smith. But, from experience, the abstract *ego* may well be supposed to escape the thralldom of mere identity with these persons. The generally acknowledged fact of unconscious cerebration points in the same direction. Still, even granting this to be so, then would remain, as we have said, the impossibility of formally expressing in any present terms of speech the elimination of the *ego* from obstructive judgment as to existence; for present terms of speech not only make suspected, but affirm, its presence in the concrete form.

To the point whence we set out we return, in the conviction that the principle attempted to be formulated by Descartes and Balmez is true, but that it is inexpressible in formal terms. The general exposition of Balmez, and the final explanation of Descartes, are luminous, but their light is almost extinguished when they attempt to put it into a lantern to guide the stumbling footsteps of mankind. Two, the same questions, as from the beginning of this discussion, confront us: first, as to whether the *ego*, as innately incapable of sound judgment regarding existence, can be deemed ever eliminated; and second, as to whether positive formal proof of existence can be given in set ratiocinative terms of speech. The former of these questions is resolvable into the latter; for if the latter be true, the former must be, but not conversely. But the latter, as we have shown, is not possible, and therefore we must revert to the former, to endeavor to show that the *ego*, in the form of the abstract *ego*, effectively eliminates the concrete *ego* as an element possibly neutralizing judgment; and that although the abstract *ego's* idea of existence cannot be formulated in set ratiocinative terms of speech, it may be formulated by discursion. What abstract self-consciousness knows synthetically may perhaps be painfully explained by continuous approximative statement. Yet the polygon, however multiplied as to sides, never becomes the inscribed circle. All that we can hope to do is to contribute, from an exceptional experience, some additional light to the subject.

It is narrated by Sir Humphry Davy that, experimenting with nitrous oxide gas, and succumbing to its influence, he conceived the whole universe resolved into thought. It is not mentioned, that we remember, in the connection, that during the conception he lost the idea of personal identity. He may have been in a condition analogous to dreaming, where his knowledge of his personal

identity (as is always the case in dreams) was blended with other experiences. Under these circumstances his general experience would place itself in the category of dream-thoughts, and would have no particular relevancy to waking phenomena of consciousness. We ourselves had in some respects a similar experience, but in the main, an entirely dissimilar experience from that of Sir Humphry Davy; which experience, although three years have since elapsed, remains at this moment as vivid as when it occurred. Here, under penalty, otherwise, of rendering the account of it ridiculous, we must drop for awhile the editorial "we."

In a brief phase following complete unconsciousness from the inhalation of nitrous oxide gas, I experienced complete restoration of consciousness, with one exception—memory. Momentarily, therefore, I was without knowledge of personal identity. Consciousness, without personal identity, for a brief period (known afterwards through witnesses to have been brief), broke into bright day, penetrated with a vast sense of potentiality, needing only the whereon to become power, brooding with majestic calm and clearness amid void. Subjectivity and objectivity were lost in the inseparable, I—think—exist. Next to the dominant sense described, was what Dr. Carpenter, the physiologist, terms "expectant attention." If it can be said that thought contemplated existence, then, equally, existence may be said to have contemplated thought. They were the same, and into the abstract *ego* both were resolvable. It was both, and they were one, and of other essence there was nothing. Solitarily, in space, I had for a few brief moments, experience that would have proved to me, had I needed proof, that although Descartes could not logically say, "I think, therefore I am;" nor Balmez, "this thought is my soul, I am;" yet, that the principle is true, with a higher truth than any formulary can express. This perception, derived from what I have justly called an exceptional experience, overrides the imperfection of logical forms, grown out of the daily needs of life, and unequal to expressing the sublime truth of existence. I regard as doubly proved, in my own experience, the belief of mankind generally, that the abstract *ego*, knowing that it thinks, knows that it exists as it believes itself to exist. In this experience was no self-consciousness. It would be answering speciously to assert that self-consciousness was present because I myself was present in myself. Philosophically, self can have no existence without its knowledge of the presence of self. I was conscious, not of my individual self, but of thought and existence, one and indivisible. As the effect of the gas passed away, then I myself rose upon my horizon, out of the abstract and greater self. "I think, therefore I exist; I exist, therefore I think,"

are to me convertible propositions, having significance far beyond the petty forms in which the ideas are illogically clothed.

As before indicated, the question remaining with some men would be: Is, or is not, this consciousness, which mankind generally regard as spiritual, solely a bodily function? We cannot prove that it is not solely a bodily function, neither can it be proved that it is. Mankind generally, convinced of the truth of the teaching of intuition, believe it to be spiritual. If consciousness—thought, mind, soul (call it what one will)—be not spiritual, then we do not exist as mankind generally believe that we exist. We have been first of all confronted with expressed doubt as to our existence, and now, if existence be granted, with doubt as to the character of the existence. If the latter doubt, as formulated materialistically, represents truth, then all that has been said here, and all that may be urged in the same direction, falls to the ground.

The conclusion, then, to which we are forced, is that the *ego* and existence—the latter as to very existence, the former as to essence—are thinkable, believable, but not demonstrable. But we may well hold, with mankind generally, that these belong to a higher order of truths than man is capable of testing with ratiocination. Here we must all rest, for we have reached the foundation of reasoning. If we have not in intuition, from self-consciousness,—the consciousness of consciousness,—knowledge of existence, of its essence, of its significance, certain it is that the knowledge can be derived from no source, physiological or psychological, or both, through discursion. Nay, more, if it could be so derived, the result could not be expressed in forms of language as they now exist, because language has not grown by dealing with fundamental thought, but by accepting fundamental thought, and expressing the needs of life upon the assumption of postulates derived from intuition and experience.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PRAYER.

AS there never was a time when the world found itself without a religion, so there never was a time when prayer was unknown, or when men did not practise it. Prayer is an active element in the religious economy of the world, whatever form religion may assume. Even Comte found a place for it in the machinery of that curious form of religion which is connected with his name, and in which all his positivist disciples worship humanity personified as the only being to which man owes homage. Not less wonderful, it has even the approval of Professor Tyndall, provided, however, that a form of it be devised "in which the heart might express itself without putting the intellect to shame," whatever that means. Presumably he means by it that, whilst prayer, considered as a power in the physical or moral world, is a superstition from which the intellect revolts, it may be useful as a kind of safety-valve by which the feelings of the heart may be poured out, and that this outpouring may have a reactionary influence whereby the heart is purified and the sentiment stirred up. In other words, prayer may be tolerated on the principle on which some parents nowadays send their children to Sunday-school; because, although of course religion is only a fancy, it does "the little ones" good; it keeps them together; it teaches their "little steps of stairs" to be neat and tidy.

This admission of prayer, as something worth retaining in some sense or for some purpose, is but a feeble echo of the voice of humanity coming down to us through all time. It is a want of our nature; a craving that comes out spontaneously from the soul. It is inborn in us, like religion, with which it is inseparably bound up. Religion may appear, nay, has appeared, under different forms. Grotesque, irrational, these forms may be; but there never yet has been a religion in which prayer of some kind has not been given an important place and admitted as an essential element. With Pagan and Christian, Jew and Gentile, it is all the same.

In one of his Notre Dame conferences Lacordaire says: "All religions have called sacrifices, ceremonies, and prayer to the help of the soul striving towards God. Homer immolates victims with the liturgy of Leviticus; Delphos commands expiations in the same language which Benares speaks; the Etruscan augury blesses the Roman hills as the Druid consecrated the forests of Gaul; and above all those living rites of invisible custom the sacrament of prayer rises towards God to demand miracles of Him in the name

of all grief that hopes and of all weakness that believes. Doubtless prayer has not always known God under the same name; it has not everywhere known His true and eternal history; but the want was everywhere the same, the aspiration similar, and when the heart was sincere prayer did not fail to be efficacious." The same author, speaking of the supernatural intercourse between God and man, says: "Those among the sages who, like Plato, have left a religious memory, were all penetrated with serious respect for the vestiges of a tradition whose history they ignored. They avowed the infirmity of human thought left to its own resources, and endeavored to raise themselves toward God by the irrational effort of prayer. They belonged to the party of saints by desire, to the party of sages by ignorance."

"Mahomet," the same author says elsewhere, "made prayer the practical foundation of his religious edifice." Who that has read ever so little of Greek or Roman literature, has not over and over again met with references to libations, vows, and prayers to the gods of paganism? Homer, writing of propitiatory sacrifices to the offended Deities, thus expresses his own belief and that of his time and race:

"Offending man their high compassion wins,
And daily prayers atone for daily sins."

Let Pythagoras give evidence for the philosophers. He says:

"In all thou dost, first let thy prayers ascend,
And to the gods thy labors first commend;
From them implore success, and hope propitious end."

Plutarch, writing against the Epicureans, says that nobody ever found a people who had not their gods to whom they offered sacrifices and prayers to obtain benefits and to avert evil.

Here, then, we have prayer running unmistakably through every form of religion, and forming an important element in each; and there never has been a people without a religion of some kind. A fact so universal, so constant, must be accounted for. Whence has it come? It cannot be attributed to the choice or caprice of individuals or peoples; and that, for the very reason of its universality and constant presence in the history of every religion, in every age. We must go back further, then, and search for the reason of it in the nature of man. We must see if it be not an office that springs directly and at once from his conscience, teaching him the duty of prayer apart from, and independently of, any positive revealed law.

It is necessary now to bear in mind that prayer implies more than its ordinarily received meaning. Praying is petitioning God,

as we commonly understand it. But it means, moreover, adoration and thanksgiving; and a petition to God may be either for the pardon of faults or the granting of favors. There is nothing more natural to us than to be enraptured by the beautiful, to admire the sublime, to honor goodness and wisdom, to reverence greatness and power. One instinctively regards with respect the genius of Aristotle, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, and the other giant intellects that have arisen in the world's history from time to time, however he may differ from their teaching and principles. So it is with warriors, painters, sculptors, poets, etc.,—Alexander, Napoleon, Raphael, Michel-Angelo, Shakespeare, or Dante. A man may dislike the men, but he must admire their genius. Do not we not merely feel, but give spontaneous expression to our feelings, in the presence of the sublime or the beautiful in nature or in art? Clearly it was this that made men turn to the sun and moon, to rivers and mountains, and worship them, when, dulled by sin and passion, they had turned from and forgotten the one true God. It is not true, as it has been said, that by a law of indefinite progress, monotheism was the outcome of polytheism. The reverse is true; or, rather, it is true that polytheism stepped in where monotheism had died out. Men should have some form of religion, something to worship; and having lost their primitive faith in the one true God, they turned to other objects of worship, each according to his fancy or choice. It is under the same inborn influence that certain philosophers of our own day, who ignore a personal God, turn to humanity, and make it the object of their homage. All this unmistakably points to an instinctive craving in us for something to worship, and to the creation of feelings in us corresponding to the influence that objects are calculated to excite.

Now, we have our intellect, and it reasons back from effect to cause, and declares that there is a God. It cannot fathom the nature of God; it cannot comprehend Him; but it can and must know that a first cause there must be. It examines as far as it may into the nature and attributes of such a being, and it finds that a being existing of necessity must be infinitely perfect and the principle of all perfection; infinitely powerful and the principle of all power; infinitely wise and beautiful and the principle of all wisdom and beauty. It knows that itself, and everything we have, and everything that is, has come from God. Under this consciousness the intellect cannot remain unmoved. Having mounted up towards God, it bows down in homage before the Power, Wisdom, and Beauty from which all power, wisdom, and beauty spring; before the Creative Power from which everything that is has come. This is the prayer of adoration.

But there is again the heart of man. Does it remain motionless beside all this? The intellect knows the goodness of God; it sees it manifested in the creation, and again in the providence by which He preserves, governs, and guards everything, even the least that He has created.

“ Each little flower that opens,
Each little bird that sings,
He made their glowing colors,
He made their tiny wings,”

says the nursery rhyme.

Now, there are no persons we more despise than the ungrateful. This shows an innate persuasion in us that ingratitude ought not find a place in the human heart; that it is an exotic that ought not be there, but that ought to be plucked up and gratitude sown in its stead. Man is by nature disposed to gratitude for benefits received; ingratitude is a contraband import that the law of his nature prohibits him from entertaining. And as the knowledge of God and His attributes calls forth from the intellect the prayer of adoration, gratitude for the blessing of creation and the untold blessings dispensed by the providence of God calls forth from the heart the prayer of thanksgiving. Once more, the intellect knows that mercy is an attribute of God, and trusting to His mercy we are most naturally moved to ask Him for pardon of our faults. We know that goodness is an attribute of His, and we ask Him to manifest His providence in our behalf in the way of granting spiritual and temporal favors that we need, or of averting spiritual or temporal evils that we fear.

Looked at, then, in the light of natural religion, prayer is both a duty and a necessity; and the necessity enforces the duty. Other considerations may be made use of to establish our position; and the argument we have used, if drawn out to greater length, would show itself more forcible and convincing. Enough has, however, been said for our purpose. Viewed directly, and with the light of sound philosophy, the way appears quite clear. But another philosophy throws another light upon it, and makes impediments appear, or rather casts them in the way; and these it is our purpose to remove, or rather to show that they are not what they appear to be. We have abstained, too, from strengthening our position by the aid of revealed religion, because with the exception of some illogical persons, those who deny the use or the necessity of prayer deny also that there is a revealed religion. So unmistakably does Revelation inculcate prayer that we are perforce driven into the admission or denial of both together. Of course we nevertheless claim the aid and testimony of Sacred Scripture as an historical witness to the belief of man from the very beginning,

that the need of prayer is involved in the need of our intercourse with God.

Although prayer, as we have seen, holds, and has always held, an important place in every system of religion worthy of the name, it does not constitute religion. That was the error of the Messalinians, a sect, partly Pagan and partly Christian, that flourished for a time in the East. They taught that the disposition of Divine Providence is variable, and may be changed by prayer; also that every one has a devil attached to him from his birth, and that prayer only can banish it. These and other absurdities that they taught are exceeded in absurdity by the practices of their lives.

On the other hand, there are those with whom prayer of any kind would be illogical and meaningless—even the prayer of adoration and thanksgiving. Such are atheists and pantheists. The former, because they admit no object they might pray to; the latter, because they are themselves an essential part of a necessary whole, which, therefore, for obvious reasons, it would be folly for them to adore or praise, and useless to petition for good or against evil. To these must be added a large number of pseudo-philosophers of the present day, whose avowed principles, whatever be their professions, logically and immediately merge into one or the other.

Beyond this the question turns exclusively on the prayer of petition; and those who repudiate it as a thing absurd, or at least useless, do so for various reasons. To allow it any efficacious influence, and therefore any meaning, it is necessary to recognize Divine Providence, to begin with. That is a preliminary position without which prayer would necessarily be without effect and without a purpose. When one prays, he prays for something to be obtained or averted, and this implies a hope that the prayer may be heard and the desired result produced. Prayer offered for no definite purpose, and without an expectation or any reason for expecting that any good may come of it, would be irrational, unless one may set himself to pray for pastime. But if God, having created the universe, stopped there, and thenceforth let it take its natural course, like a sovereign who, having set the affairs of his government in motion, betakes himself to some apartment whence he watches everything, but never interferes; in other words, if there be no Providence governing the world, prayer at once becomes an impious mockery, or, at most, a purposeless trifling. Hence, into that school of theism that would have God take as little concern about us and the world as a watchmaker does about a timepiece he has made, set its mechanism in motion, and sold, prayer can never enter. To these, as to the last-mentioned class, we have nothing to say. The ground of their denial of prayer is their denial of Providence; and to prove the efficacy of the former

against them we should begin by establishing the reality of the latter. But that is outside our purpose. Besides, after we had asserted the providence of God, the difficulty may not, and likely would not, end there. For, granted that the universe is governed by Providence, what are we to understand by it? Different theorists attach different meanings to it, and some of them seem as incompatible with prayer as no providence at all. Indeed, providence, in the sense in which it is understood and explained by some, is really no providence at all.

We shall take up, then, and consider a few of the leading difficulties which unbelievers in the reasonableness of prayer throw out but to justify their position according to their respective notions of Divine Providence. Other difficulties, such as disbelief in any interference on the part of God with the course and order of the world, lead the way to, and ultimately end in, that one. The nucleus of our difficulty lies in showing that the incompatibility of prayer with God's action in the world is only apparent, not real. When repulsed from other positions, they will fly to this, and it is the last battle-ground they can take up.

Now, then, they urge the untenableness of prayer because of its incompatibility with the unchangeableness, knowledge, and goodness of God on the one hand, and on the other with the system of laws decreed by Him for the government of the world. "Do what we can," says Jules Simon, "it is impossible to take away from God His immutability and eternity. Prayer brings us no other good than to draw us nearer to God by meditation and love." Moreover, is not God all-seeing, and does He not know our desires and our needs? Is He not infinitely good, and will He not, knowing them, satisfy the one if it be good for us, and provide for the other if it be real? But the theory of prayer implies either that we may have wants and wishes which God may not know, or that, knowing them, His goodness may possibly not provide for them without the importunity of our prayers.

We have, on the other hand, to deal with the alleged incompatibility of prayer with the uniformity that science has discovered in the laws of nature. "Say that it has come by design, by chance, or from necessity, just as it pleases you; that it has been prearranged by a personal God, or that it is the outcome of nature existing always, one thing is certain," they say, namely, that the universe is governed by an unvarying law, which it would be vain to attempt to break or disturb. This is a scientific certainty, and anything opposed to it must be unscientific and untrue. It implies, therefore, the unreasonableness of prayer, because it deprives it of an office and a purpose. It ignores it as a thing silly and unsubstantial, leaving it no scientific basis on which to rest. And this prin-

ciple of uniformity in nature seems to confront prayer from every side to which its influence is directed. For we pray either (*a*) for temporal blessings, or the averting of temporal evils, such as rain, fair weather, the cessation of a pestilence, or the curing of a fever; (*b*) for spiritual blessings, or the averting of spiritual evils, such as an increase of grace, protection from temptation, etc.; or (*c*) for social blessings, or the averting of social evils, such as, that sounder principles may govern the political and religious life of the nation, that principles opposed to public morality and the public weal may be discountenanced and checked. But there is this unvarying law governing the *physical*, the *moral*, and the *social* world, and it frustrates the assumed power of prayer, or, rather, denies that it has any.

In the first instance, prayer finds its opponents in a certain class of physicists who are remarkable for arrogating to themselves a monopoly of knowledge in physical science, as if nobody else knew anything about it. "They ask for fair weather or for rain," says Professor Tyndall, "but they do not ask that water may run up a hill, while the man of science clearly sees that the granting of one petition would be just as much an infringement of the law of conservation as the granting of the other. Holding the law to be permanent, he prays for neither." Possibly it was a similar belief that drew from Lord Palmerston the well-known reply he made to the deputation asking him to order public prayers against the cholera: "Don't mind your prayers, but keep the sewers cleansed." In the second place, according to a certain school of psychologists, mental phenomena are under laws quite as fixed as those that govern the physical world; and hence it is no less irrational to pray for grace, or against temptation, than for fair weather or against a plague. From this the distance is very short and easy to the third ground of opposition, namely, that peoples no less than individuals are guided and governed by an inflexible law. The philosophy of history has been taught by many on this hypothesis. The theory as held by Buckle is summarized in the following words by Justin McCarthy, in his "History of our own Times:" "All movements of history, and, indeed, of human life, through all its processes, are regulated by fixed physical laws as certain as those which rule the motions of the waves and the changes of the weather, and of which we could arrive at a sound and trustworthy knowledge if we were content to study their phenomena as we do the phenomena of the seas and the skies." It is therefore useless, indeed impious, to pray for, let us say, the extirpation of socialism or the conversion of England. We may here observe that under the second class may logically be brought Calvinists, Jansenists,

Wyclifites, and all, in a word, who, on principle, must address God in the words of Robert Burns :

" Oh Thou, wha in the heavens dost dwell,
Wha, as it pleases best, Thysel',
Sends one to heaven and ten to hell,
A' for Thy glory,
And no for any good or ill
They've done afore Thee !"

The difficulties raised against the efficacy of prayer because of the immutability of God, and against its reasonableness because of His knowledge and goodness, are easily disposed of. The difficulty brought from the immutability of God proves too much against prayer, and, therefore, as logicians say, proves nothing. It would, if it had any force at all, militate against the creation quite as well.

The following words of Origen and St. Thomas will suffice to dispel it. The former, writing against Celsus, says : " God, remaining the same, administers changeable things according to their nature and as reason demands that they should be administered." The latter says : " It is one thing to change the will, it is another thing to will a change in anything. For any one, his will remaining unchanged, may will one thing now and its contrary afterwards."¹ The *now* and the *afterwards*, it is to be observed, refer to the object, not to the will directing the change. That prayer implies limited knowledge or limited goodness on the part of God, will appear equally false from the words of St. Thomas. He says : " God gives us many things without our asking them. But it is for our good that He requires us to ask some things; for we thus acquire a confidence in Him, and at the same time acknowledge Him as the author of everything we have."² We are apt to forget gifts and benefactors unless we feel that we may need them again. And if every want of ours, spiritual and temporal, were supplied by God as a matter of course, and without our asking, we would soon forget to look upon them as favors, and would come to look on them as our due. We would eventually forget our dependence on God, because the need of prayer is our best reminder of it; and absolution from the duty of prayer would easily lead to neglect of adoration.

Then again, belief in prayer is dismissed by a certain school of physicists as an irrational superstition of the credulous, but beneath the patronage of science,—indeed, opposed to its progress and destructive of its interests. That the law of phenomenal sequence runs through nature, can, they say, be neither disputed nor ignored.

¹ Summa, I, quest. 19, art. 7.

² Summa, xxii, quest. 83, art. 2.

It is a fact. It is not the offspring of the imagination, but the conviction of reason; not a law made to order to suit a purpose, but that has forced itself on the student of nature by the power of its persuasiveness and the evidence of its truth. Physical causes, then, always produce their natural effects. If the causes of rain be present, rain will come, and as long as these causes remain, and all the circumstances to be considered continue favorable, rain will continue. If these causes, considered with their circumstances, cease, rain will cease, and fair weather, frost or snow, according to causes and circumstances, will ensue. If a certain disease, all circumstances considered, be more than the vital power of its patient can endure, it will be fatal; if not, or if it be properly diagnosed and treated by medical skill, the patient will recover. But death or recovery, rainy or fair weather—in either case, prayer can have no place as a cause, and it would be irrational to admit it. Strychnine will poison, sugar will taste sweet, vinegar sour, and fire will burn. What nonsense, then, to believe that St. Benedict disinfected the poisoned cup by his prayer, or that certain martyrs passed unscathed through the ordeal of fire! If your friend be ill of a fever, pray, if you please, for your friend's recovery; if you want rain, pray, if you please, that it may come; but do not in the name of reason be guilty of the folly of thinking that your prayer has had a share in bringing about either result, although both should come. What has happened would have happened though never prayed for; what has not happened has not failed to happen because you have not prayed, nor would it have happened though you had prayed.

The objection is specious; but it is nothing more. Although physical science has made us acquainted with the laws of nature to a surprising extent, all, nevertheless, are not known to us. There are forces in nature, perhaps, which we have yet to discover. There are many which we know, but do not know the full value of. There may be a thousand complications and circumstances that influence the relative action of forces on one another that we are yet ignorant of. But they are all within God's knowledge and under His power. What right, then, has any one to say that God does not interfere in this or that instance, in answer to prayer, with causes and circumstances which do not appear to us in connection with the result prayed for, but which, combined and prearranged, issue in causes which, with their attendant circumstances, produce, it is true, their natural effect, but an effect owing none the less to Divine interposition in answer to prayer. God certainly may do so; how can any one dare to say that He does not?

The physical forces at work in the world are a vast and complicated machinery, the parts of which have been arranged and the whole designed by the wisdom of God; and when we can say that

we understand it all, if we find to a certainty that it leaves no room for Divine interposition, we might then with some reason deny the power of prayer. But until then, it is but an irrational skepticism that would ask men to reject as folly a belief that they have held from the beginning, a tradition that is as sacred as nature itself, because as old.

But even granting, it may be said, that God may and does interfere with the laws of nature, that does not help to dislodge the difficulty. It leaves it exactly in the same position, because the fact remains all the same that the laws of nature are interfered with, and their uniformity destroyed; and that science will not tolerate. Now, this brings us face to face with a consideration that is overlooked in the objection, and that ought not to be. It is this: The objection assumes that prayer had no place in the original design of the world in the conception of God. It implies that prayer is something that takes God as if by surprise, and importunes Him to disturb the prearranged harmony of things. It implies, too, that Divine interposition does not enter into the governing of the world, whereas, not only does it, but continually does. "It does not follow," says Dr. Ward, "that because the laws of nature are fixed, they proceed independently of God's constant and unremitting premovement." It is not in answer to prayer that this interposition is constant, for God interferes always; but He has decreed eternally that it would be sometimes in answer to prayer. He thus made prayer enter into and be one of the laws that govern the world. Therefore St. Thomas says that "we pray not to change what Divine Providence has disposed, but to ask that what He has disposed would come to pass." We commend to those who may wish to read it the argument of St. Thomas contained in Art. II., Ques. 83, in the *secunda secundæ*; it dissipates the difficulty in a few sentences.

The Rev. Mr. Knight, in an article in the *Contemporary Review*, for January, 1873, whilst admitting prayer as an agency in the spiritual world, denies it any power in the physical world. One of the reasons that he gives is that "there is no confusion of the spheres of moral and physical agency. To put it otherwise, a spiritual antecedent will not produce a physical consequent." Now, this seems strange logic. If he means that the spiritual act of prayer will not bring down showers of rain from the clouds or make the sun shine, it is of course true; but surely it was not necessary to tell us so. If he means that God, in answer to prayer, cannot or will not produce physical effects, he makes an assertion that he ought to prove, and does not. To say that God cannot do it is impious; to say that He will not do it is precisely supposing the question. Again he says: "It is vain to reply that we are

continually interfering with seemingly fixed laws of the universe, and altering their destination by our voluntary activities or scientific appliances; for in all such cases we simply make use of existing forces. We are ourselves a part of the physical cosmos, and in accordance with its laws we exert a power which changes external nature. But we can never escape from the domain of law." Quite so; but all this is but a levelling down of the denial he has been laboring to build up; a corroborating by his testimony of what he has proposed to demolish. This dialectical suicide arises from having overlooked two things: 1st, the fact of a Divine premovement in the government of the world; 2d, that prayer enters into the action of that premovement. Before any one can afford to deny the efficacy of prayer, he must first of all show the falsity of these. To admit the efficacy of prayer, it is not at all necessary to go outside the "domain of law." That God answers prayer does not necessarily nor always mean that He works a miracle, although it is true that the denial of prayer involves a denial of miracles.

But if, let it be replied, prayer enters into the eternal disposition of God, it follows that something happens as the result of prayer; some effects are produced because they have been prayed for. What, then, if they had not been prayed for? Would they have happened, or would they not? If they would, they would have happened without prayer, and then prayer was useless; and if useless in these cases, why not in every case? If they would not have happened, then the uniformity of the law of nature would have been destroyed, not however, from the effect, but from the defect of prayer. They did not happen because prayer was not offered to obtain them. Here, then, is a result logically flowing from the theory of prayer. The free will of man and the eternal decrees of God are placed in direct antagonism, ready to destroy each other. For, if we may refuse to pray for a certain thing that is to be obtained by prayer, we elude and frustrate the Divine disposition; if we may not refuse to pray on that particular occasion and for that particular purpose, it must be because God has taken away our free-will in order to make us an instrument wherewith to have His decree executed. What shall we say to this? We have already observed that in the disposition of God some things will happen without prayer, and some things will happen in answer to prayer; and we say that when these latter are to happen, prayer will infallibly be offered to obtain them. We say *infallibly*, not *necessarily*. For St. Thomas says: "God has prepared necessary causes for certain effects, that they would necessarily follow; for others He has prepared contingent causes, that they would follow contingently according to the nature of the proximate causes;"¹

¹ Summa, 1, quest. 22, art. 4.

"for," he says, "all things happen according to His provision, whether necessarily or contingently."¹ Again, "if it be the provision of God that this or that would happen, it will happen, and according to His provision. If He provides that it would happen contingently, it will, indeed, infallibly happen, but contingently, not necessarily."² We hope that these quotations from the Angelic Doctor will suffice to dispel this seeming antagonism between our free-will and the Divine disposition arising from the doctrine of prayer. The whole force of St. Thomas's argument rests on the distinction that one may *infallibly* do a thing without *necessarily* doing it.

But we have not yet gone quite half way. It is not for temporal blessings exclusively that prayer is offered; it is also offered, and indeed much more frequently, for spiritual blessings. But the psychologist of the Herbert Spencer type steps in and reminds us that mind no less than matter is governed by law; that there is a persistency in the connection between the different states of consciousness as there is in the order of events that come under the consideration of physical science. And setting out from this law, the philosopher just named traces the growth of the human mind from instinct, on through regular gradations of development, to reason and moral consciousness. "In all this," psychologists ask, "where is the place for prayer, or what can its office be?"

Of course we repudiate the system of psychology on which the difficulty is based, to begin with. But supposing it to be true, it shuts out prayer for the same reason as does physical science, for both proceed on analogous principles. What we have said, therefore, to show the reasonableness of prayer, notwithstanding the one, holds equally good against the other. Indeed the psychical difficulty is not so involved as the physical. We have seen how the objection drawn from physical science indirectly brings on the question of free-will; but in the other case this cannot be, and for the very good reason that the system of psychology that patronizes the objection cannot suppose such a thing as free-will, unless perhaps in name. But there is another consideration that deprives the psychologist of any logical right to reject prayer, and it flows from his own principles. It cannot be denied that prayer has always and everywhere held a place in the belief of men. The psychologist may deny its right to be there, but he cannot deny the fact. Whence came it? Either it was inducted by man himself through superstition, or from other motives, or it is a natural growth in the mind. If the former, then man may, as he pleases, regulate the action of his mind; and if man can, why not God?

¹ Summa, I, quest. 22, art. 4, ad 2.

² Gentiles, quest. 3, chap. 94.

If the latter, then the psychologist, in attempting to shut out prayer as a thing irrational, stands self-convicted himself of the most irrational of acts.

Then, lastly, we may not pray for social blessings or the averting of social evils, because if the "movements of history are regulated by fixed physical laws," the philosophy of history is quite as much a science as the philosophy of nature. It will not be necessary for us to say anything on this phase of the difficulty, as it has been already met in the last. For what is the material element in society but the aggregate of the individuals who compose it? As the individual is, therefore, so will be the social edifice which he contributes an individual's mind and an individual's morality to build up.

So much for objections. There are others of a particular character that might be brought up and examined with profit, did space permit. We have selected those we have examined, because they strike at the root of prayer by trying to undermine its principles; and we have classified them both with a view to conciseness, and that the ground of attack may appear more clear.

We will bring this already rather lengthy article to a close by recalling a test which Professor Tyndall, some years since, thought of applying to the efficacy of prayer. It is, as will be perceived, characteristic of men of his class. He proposed, if we do not mistake, that in a certain hospital the proportion of those who die and recover to those attacked by a certain disease would be carefully noted down; that a ward would then be set apart for all cases of the same disease, that they would be treated with the same medical skill as before, and, in addition, that public prayers would be offered up for their recovery. After the experiment had got a fair chance, he would have the percentage of deaths and recoveries ascertained, and thus see if the prayers had effected any good.

Risum teneatis, amici! The test reminds us of a blasphemous challenge which Mr. Bradlaugh is reported to have made, when, on an occasion of his lecturing on atheism, he pulled out his watch and gave God five minutes to strike him dead. If he was not struck dead in the given time, the conclusion was to be that there is no such being as God. We have heard that an Irish working-man present, on hearing the blasphemy, at once started up and replied: "Wisha, God has something else to do than to waste His time with a fellow like you." Although Professor Tyndall's test is not as revolting as this, it is scarcely less meaningless. To omit other reflections on it, it will be enough to observe:

1st. It wants the very first condition of prayer, namely, sincerity. When we pray we are supposed to be in earnest; but here there would be no earnestness, for the prayers would be offered only

nominally for the recovery of the patients, but really to put prayer to a test. This is simply tempting God. Had Professor Tyndall seriously wished to know the value of prayer, he could know it from the assurance of God Himself revealed in Holy Scripture and in the tradition of mankind; and if he would not hear the voice of God thus revealed, it is not likely he would recognize it in such Brahminical jugglery as this. Besides, God will not be moved to signify His will to captious incredulousness. "You ask for a sign," said our blessed Lord to the Pharisee, "but a sign you shall not get unless the sign of Jonas."

2d. The test is based on a false supposition, namely, that God will always grant in answer to prayer the specific favor prayed for.

3d. How could it be known that prayers were not offered up also for the patients who were treated in the hospital before the special ward was set apart for the prayer test? They may not be public prayers; they may not be as many; but they may be more efficacious. The power of prayer does not proceed on the principle of mechanics, that a system of levers will do more work than one. The humble prayer of one may avail more before God than the united prayers of a thousand. Then, if the percentage of recoveries turned out to be higher in the special ward than it was before, would Professor Tyndall, we wonder, believe in prayer on the strength of his own test? Perhaps the light of science may reveal to him, in the meantime, some new physiological law that brought about the high percentage of cures. We ask, may not the result of the prayer-test possibly be this: If the percentage of cures under the test happened to be lower than usual, prayer was found out to be useless? If it turned out to be higher, it was owing to a complicity of physiological causes and circumstances, but not to prayer? In the first event, the result told against prayer; in the second event, it did not tell for it.

THE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.

IN the year 1839 there was, in the heart of the Oxford movement, a dear friend of Mr. Newman's, a brother of Lord Selborne, recently Lord Chancellor of England, who had ardently embraced the notion of a Christendom broken into three unequal portions, not absolutely severed from each other, yet very imperfectly united. These were the Roman, Greek and Anglican Churches. To the mind of Mr. Palmer, then a Fellow of Magdalen College, there was something particularly attractive in the quaint, antique, poetic and oriental forms of the Russian Church. He saw in it a multitude of long-established types and symbols, sacramental in their nature because consecrated to the service of religion, and teeming with instruction in the mysteries of the faith. He desired to be admitted into communion with this vast Greco-Russian society, and before leaving England he fortified himself with documents from the hands of Dr. Routh, the head of Magdalen College, and placed himself in communication with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Such a proceeding may at the present moment appear to be the result of a singular delusion; but that also it appeared to Mr. Palmer himself as time went on, for in 1855 he was received into the Catholic Church, and repudiated for ever the supposed catholicity of the English Convocation and the Russian Synod alike. He had for some years been cruising about in Anglican waters for the discovery of "signs of catholicity," and had fancied he found even there what the people of England certainly could not find, an apostolical succession, the real presence, an altar and a priesthood; how much more, therefore, would his imagination find the Russian waters full of these catholic signs of the presence of Christ and the saints, the living sacraments, the covenanted gifts of Grace.

It was in this frame of mind that the young Oxford examiner found himself in St. Petersburg, in the midst of a church-going population. Very different was their mode of attendance from that of Protestant or Catholic. It was not with the Protestant bustle and eagerness for the instruction of preachers, nor with the Catholic devotion in the adoration of the Host, but rather in distinct and innumerable acts of reverence, prayer and praise, towards saints, angels or *icons*. A great deal had to be *done*. Scarcely a limb was at rest, pious gesticulations were abundant, there were bowings and crossings, *icons* were kissed, the ground was touched, sometimes audibly thumped with the forehead, and wax lights were set

up to burn, while soft and most peculiar music filled the air and soothed the thoughts. There was neatness around and magnificence; the people seemed to be in earnest, they all confessed and communicated once a year, and many of the more devout four times, once at each of the four fasts. It was not, therefore, without pleasure that Mr. Palmer listened to that sweet and solemn singing of the *Hospodi pomì lui* (*Kyrie eleison*) in the Church of the Ascension, and saw the splendid pictures lit up, while the sharp treble voices of the boys mixed with the deeper tones of the older singers of the congregation. It is a question, he said, of association of ideas, and rites that are very different may by custom be alike hallowed to the mind and the means of bringing it into happy intercourse with the Eternal Spirit. There is something unique in the richness and softness of the music in some of the Russian Ambassadors' chapels and churches at which the Emperor or members of the Imperial family are present. Five and twenty years ago the music in the Russian Ambassadors' chapel at Rome—we think it was in the Corso—was remarkable for its sweetness and peculiar character, unlike anything we had ever heard before. Lady Bloomfield tells us in her diary of February 1st, 1846: "I went to a private rehearsal of the choir of the Emperor's chapel, and I was surprised and delighted with the beauty of the music, which certainly exceeded any I had ever heard. I only regretted that the music was performed in too small a room for the voices to be sufficiently appreciated; the effect would have been so much grander had I been at a greater distance from the choir. There were about eighty-six voices altogether, which was not the full complement; but with his usual magnificence, the Emperor sent 12 of the finest voices to Rome, that on her arrival there the Empress might have her own choir. Nothing could exceed the beauty of the voices, and their gradual swelling and decreasing was very striking. . . . The finest voices come from White Russia; but whenever any one throughout the Empire has an unusually rich voice he is engaged, and certainly I never heard such voices—from the deepest diapason bass to the highest tenor. Bartniansky's music is very impressive. The words are Slavonic; and those which are sung during the administration of the Holy Communion are in the following sense: 'Let us not approach Thee, O Lord, in this Thy holy Sacrament, like the traitor Judas, who betrayed Thee with a kiss; but as the thief upon the cross, let us, with deep humility and unfeigned sorrow, confess our sinfulness, and cry, Lord, remember me.'" ¹ "The singing in churches here," says Mr. Palmer in another stage of his visit, "is certainly very pleasing, suited to the sense of the words, moving and devout. . . . Where there is a choir of singers, some parts of the services are sung to music

¹ *Reminiscences of Court and Diplomatic Life*, vol. i. pp. 179-181.

arranged in parts. This music, which is based upon that of the books, is not printed. It has much in it borrowed from the Italian. Some time ago a certain first-rate Italian singer, being in the *kapella* or practicing-room of the choir of the Winter Palace, was moved to tears by what they were singing when she came in, though she did not know a word of Russ, nor was told till afterwards that what she heard was part of the office for the dead. The singings for the Resurrection at Easter inspire the whole congregation with the most lively joy; it is impossible not to feel transported; the responses to the priest's announcement, 'Christ is risen!' are made with an indescribable buzz or hum (*cum fremitu*) running over the whole church. Fortununatoff's mother had a great wish to die in Easter week, and this is a popular feeling."

But here we must offer excuses to our readers if we appear to be tricking out an effete schism in attractive colors or endeavoring to recommend the system bequeathed to men by Photius, and repaired for a brief period only at the council of Lyons in 1274. Five hundred bishops were then present, and a great number of inferior prelates. At the close of the fourth session, the Pope, with gushing tears, intoned the *Credo* in Latin, which being done, the former Patriarch of Constantinople, Germanus, began it in Greek, and the "filioque" was chanted twice over. That happy reunion was not destined to endure, and for many ages the sectarians of the Greek and Russian Churches have ranged themselves under the Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Patriarch resident at Moscow, or the Emperor of Russia himself. Cut off from the centre of unity, and refusing to the Vicar of Christ and successor of St. Peter his due honor and obedience, this vast body is deprived of innumerable blessings and left comparatively barren and desolate where it might have abounded in the gifts of grace. Nothing that we may say to show that it still lives, that it is still a Christian organism, that it has in it much that is venerable and lovely, must be interpreted as meaning anything more than that it may be restored and partake fully of the benedictions which belong to the earthly Eden and the Garden of the Lord. It is necessary to state this very distinctly, so that all misinterpretation may be avoided, because Mr. Palmer, whose steps we are about to follow, was possessed of other ideas, and was travelling in Russia in the belief that he was in the midst of Catholics and that he had become one himself by the ministrations and sacraments of the Anglican Church. We shall rejoice, however, as he rejoiced, at every token of good, every gleam of Catholic beauty we can discover around us in the far North, and hope that the dream of reunion in which he indulged will ultimately be realized.

The rule of the old Patriarchs has gone by, and their power has

gradually been accumulated into the hands of the Tsars. They had obtained considerable political influence, and Peter the Great, being jealous of this, omitted to appoint a successor to the Patriarch of Moscow in 1700. The interregnum lasted for 21 years, and then the Patriarchate was formally abolished and the "Holy Synod" took its place. Since that time the control and regulation of the Russian Church have been committed to its keeping. Peter obtained from the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Constantinople and Alexandria, assembled in council, a recognition of this new arrangement and of the right of the Russian Sovereign to a complete protectorate over the Church of the country. It is he who nominates all the members of the Holy Synod, Archbishops, Bishops, and Archimandrites, with their lay assessors, and the supremacy of the Tsar has been established without any breach of communion with the "Orthodox Greek Church."¹

But the national Church is not, by this means, so secularized as to cease to be dogmatic. It still plumes itself upon its points of faith. You enter the magnificent chapel of a foundling hospital, and you find a great number of children, singing all together the Creed in the "grace" before their dinner, and producing a volume of the sweetest sound. You desire exact information respecting their tenets, and you are referred immediately to "The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church, A.D. 1643," "The Confession of Dositheus or the Eighteen Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem, A.D. 1672," and the "Longer Catechism of the Russian Church, prepared by Philaret, revised and approved by the Most Holy Synod, A.D. 1839."

A year or two before Mr. Palmer visited St. Petersburg, Mr. Blackmore translated from the Russ "The full Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Church" (of Russia), and English travellers now have not the least difficulty in obtaining information on the subject of the teaching of the Russian clergy. They profess to stand on the ground of the Seven Ecumenical Councils and the tradition of the undivided Church, from which they maintain that the Eastern Church has never swerved—an assertion which, of course, the Latins altogether dispute. Their faith is not dead. An officer observed to Mr. Palmer that they have an unspeakable consolation in their belief that the Blessed Sacrament is really Christ's Body and Blood. Religious books do not abound among them, but Mr. Palmer has given, in his Appendix, a list of as many as forty-four such works, besides the Synodal Collection of Fathers, translated into Russ, which are sold in St. Petersburg and Moscow. But there

¹ The Russian Empire, by S. B. Boulton, 1882, pp. 43-44.

² Schaff's "Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches," 1877.

can be no doubt that spiritual and intellectual life is retarded by schism, and that the Russians in general take little interest in the movements and questions of nations further south. But to say of them, as Mr. Wallace says,¹ that "of theology and of what Protestants term the 'inner religious life' the Russian peasant has no conception," is to go beyond the truth.

Inactive minds are always a prey to superstitions, and the Russians are specially deluded by the idea that the preservation of the body for an unusual length of time in an incorrupt state is a sign of sanctity and is miraculous, whereas Cardinal Newman takes particular care in his notes to show that such incorruption often arises from natural causes and sometimes occurs in the case of persons who have led wicked lives. Cardinal Lambertini (Benedict XIV.) does not go beyond this—that "writers on canonization commonly admit that the incorruption (as they speak) of a corpse is to be accounted a miracle, *in case* it is clear that the man whose corpse is in question was, in his lifetime, conspicuous for heroic virtues." The Patriarchs, having surrendered their rights into the hands of the Tsar, have forfeited their existence as an order, have paralyzed the action of their Church as a spiritual body, have frozen up, to a great extent, the waters of salvation, and punished the fault and error of severing their communion from the See of Peter. It remains to be seen whether repentance and reënlighenment will ever again restore them to unity, and rescue them from many superstitions. Nothing can show more clearly than the Coronation service used in Russia the state of subjection of the Church to the Tsar. Mr. Palmer has pointed out with great accuracy—insomuch that Cardinal Newman does not think it necessary to confirm his statements by any references—the points in the Ritual, both in word and act, indicating the imperial supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs. Everything is made to proceed from his own *proprio motu*. The Emperor Paul, who crowned himself at Moscow in 1797, and is regarded by Mr. Palmer as the founder of a new dynasty, after the Liturgy, or Mass, read aloud publicly in the church that act regulating the Imperial succession by which the present dynasty was established in its rights. He then placed it upon the altar, where, or behind which, it is still preserved. It contains the words he had just before read aloud, that the Sovereign of Russia is always to profess the creed of the Greco-Russian Church, "because he is the Head of the Church." He sat alone in the centre of the nave of the church, a carpet being laid thence up to the Holy Doors, and the members of the Synod (who may, or not, be bishops) and the bishops stood below, on either side of this carpet, opposite one another. He sat, in short, exactly as a

¹ "Russia," by D. Mackenzie Wallace, vol. i., p. 97.

patriarch or primate would sit at the head of his clergy, and showed himself visibly in the church as the Head of the Church and of the so-called Synod and all the clergy. As did the Emperor Paul, so have done the Tsars who have succeeded him.

It was still summer, in the year 1840, when Mr. Palmer was able to lay before the Ober Prokuror, Count Pratasoff, to be presented to the Emperor, the special object with which he had visited Russia, namely, to live in the Spiritual Academy, or some monastery, or under some bishop, and thus learn the Russian language, study the doctrines, discipline and ritual of the Church of the country, and be admitted into its communion, not as a convert but as a Catholic belonging to another orthodox branch of the Church of Christ. The request could not but cause great surprise for various reasons, but above all because it seemed to be wholly at variance with the habits and notions of other Englishmen and Englishwomen, including travellers, residents abroad, merchants and officials, servants, writers, bishops and archbishops, ministers, and the sovereign and supreme head of the Church of England. None of them, or at most a handful only, could be found to lend any countenance to the very peculiar views and aspirations of the Oxford Fellow.

In prosecuting his design, the singular defender of "Anglo-Catholicism" was brought into contact with persons scarcely less remarkable than himself, and the records he has given of his intercourse with them, though exceedingly simple and unpretentious, are, in the highest degree, curious and entertaining. When taken to the Synodal Palace, he was presented to M. Mourarieff, and dropped at once into the discussion of grave points with "a tall, indeed gigantic, man, for a cavalry officer, and needing a strong horse to carry him." The next acquaintance was the Arch-priest Vasili Kontnevich, High Armorer of the Army and Fleet. He ranked last of the eight members of the Synod, and so had always to give his opinion first on any matter brought before it. He conversed with Mr. Palmer in Latin, and their conversation threaded the narrow paths of the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost and of the primacy and supremacy of the Pope. The Catholic, who follows attentively this and the many subsequent debates, will remember Dr. Johnson's wise words: "The human mind is so limited that it cannot take in all the parts of a subject, so that there may be objections raised against everything;" and he will rejoice that, for him, at least, Christian dogma is settled, once for all. The Greco-Russian Church is not conscious of any such immutability, though it is not by any means given to change. Prince Alexander Galitzin, Grand Master of Requests, another acquaintance made by our traveller, admitted that there had been an inno-

vating spirit in some of the Russian divines, mentioning Philaret of Moscow as having been foremost in showing that tendency. "But, it has now," he said, "been checked." There were some manifest Latinisms in the Eighteen Articles of Bethlehem of A. D. 1672, which had been omitted or corrected (according to Mr. Palmer) in the Russian translation then recently published. The variations were concerned with the use of the words substance and accidents in reference to the subject of transubstantiation. But there were priests in Russia during Mr. Palmer's visit—the Arch-priest Kontnevich was one—who still maintained, as their own opinion, that their Church agrees with Rome about the distinction of substance and accidents in the Blessed Eucharist.¹

"In the last century," said M. Mouravieff to Mr. Palmer, "here, as everywhere else, there was a leaning towards Protestantism. Peter III. and Catherine II. did much mischief, and had well-nigh abolished the monasteries; but now all that is past, and there is everywhere a reaction, and the monks have nothing to fear. The only thing to be done now is to keep things as they are, and to improve them."

Unsatisfactory as the dogmatic status of the Greco-Russian Church must appear to a Catholic, he will be perfectly satisfied with the judgment the authorities at St. Petersburg pronounced on Mr. Palmer's application. They regarded it as altogether inadmissible, and, with every wish to be polite and conciliating, they were scarcely able to consider it seriously. It flew in the face of history and put forward a claim than which nothing could be more unreasonable. The supremacy of the Tsar was innocent and orthodox in comparison with the monstrous and even blasphemous assumptions of the British Crown. But it is to be observed that highly cultivated theologians, who were deeply sensible of the deep mental degradation of the Russian clergy and the still greater ignorance of the Greek priests, were not, on that account, a whit the less firm in their opinion that it would be impossible to admit Mr. Palmer to communion. "Any one," they said, "who would communicate with the Oriental Church, must take her just as she is, for she can do nothing to meet him."

Many privileges were accorded to Mr. Palmer seldom shared by English travellers, because seldom sought and requiring conditions for mutual intercourse seldom in existence. He visited the Monastery of St. Sergius, where he was permitted to remain for a few days, and he conversed with the Archimandrite Brenchininoff. Such monasteries have commonly a plan and appearance, such as the traveller here describes: "As one approaches from without, one sees a battlemented wall, with towers perhaps at

¹ See the "Notes of a Visit," etc., pp. 153, 169, and Schaff's "Creeds," p. 431.

intervals, especially over or near the great gates, the walls about which are painted in colors, with some scriptural or ecclesiastical history, and there will be an icon over the doorway. The walls themselves are whitewashed, but the copings of the battlements and the conical tops of the towers are colored green or red. But, before noticing them, one has probably seen in the distance, or caught glimpses at intervals, of the five gilded cupolas or crosses of the chief church, rising above the walls or among the trees, and, highest of all, the bulb of the belfry-tower. On entering, one sees the lodgings of the monks attached all round to the wall of the precinct, like casemates. Even if there is no cemetery, there will be green turf round the central church, divided by gravel-walks or flag-pavements, sometimes with avenues of trees leading up to the church, and there will be similar pavements or walls running all round the precinct in front of the cells. Probably, too, there will be a number of trees scattered about within, which, though not of any beauty or size in the north of Russia, give a more varied and more cheerful aspect to the place, especially in summer."

While staying in the Monastery of St. Sergius, and conversing from time to time with the Archimandrite, there was nothing, unfortunately, more evident than that the Russian priesthood at present, so far as it can be said to have studied the question at all, reject in the most decided manner the "Filioque" and the supremacy of the Pope, and cling with tenacity to a long list of ecclesiastical customs to which Rome would undoubtedly be averse. And what is to be the end of an empire in which the government is inseparably bound up with a Church whose vital powers are paralyzed and frozen by schism, in which the clergy are brutal and ignorant, and a Synod, not necessarily composed of bishops, sways the course of ecclesiastical affairs in obedience to the State? How will such pastors prepare the minds of the rising generation to resist and repel the fallacies of atheists, nihilists, liberals, communists, wild sectaries, bible societies, Salvation Armies, and Protestants of every type and name? Will this effete schism of Photius, so far behind the rest of the world in culture and refinement, support the Tsar in his supreme conflict with democracy, whenever that shall arrive, or rather hang like a millstone round his neck and drag him into the dust? Even in respect of civilization the married clergy and the monks are plebeian and crass. It is fearful to think of the destiny of a flock of which the shepherds are so unfit to hold the rod and staff. The state of society appears to be exceedingly corrupt, if we may judge from the fact that during the past year the police arrested in St. Petersburg 82,243 persons, of whom 76,000 were men. This makes an average of 225 arrests per day. The clergy do not take, and are not fitted to take, the lead in the

education of the people. They are persecuted with reproaches and derision; they are constantly held up to ridicule. They do not introduce into the people the life of the Spirit of God; they rest in the dead forms of outward ceremonial, which they themselves often despise; the most scandalous tales are related in regard to their morals; their habits and companions are low; the sacraments fare badly by their administrations; their slovenly garb is a symbol of their inward disorder; they give false certificates to those who do not wish to partake of the Eucharist; they practise simony and give churches to their daughters as dowries. Many, it is true, are honest, respectable, and well-intentioned, but less learned and cultivated than the Catholic clergy.¹ Other reports, proceeding from different sources, are more favorable, and in all such cases one testimony should be balanced against another. M. Voitsechovich, Director of the Chancery of the Ober-Prokuror, said to Mr. Palmer: "You should go to Moscow, and to Kieff, to see the piety of the Russian people." He knew some places where the whole population communicated four times in the year, as the Church recommends, and there were more men than women in the churches. The outrages and massacres, however, committed recently on the Jews, give us anything but a favorable idea of the piety and intelligence of Muscovite Christians. The Princess Dolgorouky told Mr. Palmer there were women "who really do not know who our Lord is, or what He did for us, so that the brutalized state of the peasantry cannot be believed by those who have not had personal knowledge of it." Another priest with whom Mr. Palmer conversed was named Stratelattoff. He spoke much of the *Procession*, and said (in Latin): "Our doctrine is this: Spiritum sanctum in Patre *per* Filium procedere, and that from all eternity the Spirit is the proper Spirit of the Son, not communicated to Him; but immanent in Him as His own Spirit." If he had quoted the decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem (1672) he would have said: πιστεύομεν πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευομενον, πατρὶ καὶ θεῷ ὁμοούσιον.² The Archpriest, Kutnevich, conversed also with Mr. Palmer on doctrinal points, particularly the Procession and Transubstantiation. He also made many subtle distinctions, and stoutly maintained the exclusive orthodoxy of the Greco-Russian Church. A Russian lady, whom Mr. Palmer met at dinner, rated him in a most amusing manner on his attempt to obtain communion, of which she had heard. She declared it would "upset all Russia. And then," she asked, "what would the different ambassadors say? No, no; *des torrents de sang doivent couler, avant que cela ait lieu*. To give communion to you would be to give it to all your Church." This

¹ Wallace's Russia, i. 89-91.

² Schaff's Creeds, p. 401.

lady's fervor must have convinced him how small were his chances of success. Besides, how were M. de Barante and the rest of the Diplomatic Corps to be appeased ?

M. Pafsky, Protopope—a very high-sounding office—of the Church of the Tauride palace, and preceptor to the Grand Duke Alexander, was a priest bewilderingly vague in his ideas of the visible unity of the Church. Even Mr. Palmer, in his Anglican days, was less foggy than he. Another priest, named Sidonsky, also a protopope and professor of philosophy, much read in German literature, said : “ We have no *need* to examine or to settle that question of the *one* Visible Church of the Creed, and we never think about it.” He boasted, as did M. Pafsky, of their Church's moderation and tolerance, saying, “ they had been careful not to condemn others.” Mr. Palmer warned them, with good reason, that when they come to have free-thinking emperors, like Frederick the Great of Prussia, or Joseph II. of Austria, or liberal prime ministers, like Pombal ; when infidels and sectarians of every kind and degree hurl themselves upon the Church, resolved to tear up its roots and break up its dominion, they will need to have examined every question concerning their claims on the obedience and confidence of their children. He spoke as if he had even then secret doubts himself of the tenability of any theory of Church government and Church unity except that maintained by the inviolate traditions of the Holy See. He was not particularly anxious to be presented to the Emperor Nicholas, though it was proposed to him that he should be. He would have been glad, if he had seen any sufficient reason for such a presentation, but he had no sort of public mission nor authority of any kind. He did not even represent his own college, much less the University of Oxford, and it was needful that he should be on his guard not to create a false impression. There were persons enough ready to speak of him as taking too much upon himself already, and appearing as a representative of others while, in fact, he represented none but himself. He had, afterwards, reason to feel satisfied with his decision in this matter, which showed on his part both prudence and modesty. He came at last to look back on his request for communion in Russia as a craze ; he spoke of it in this manner to the writer, at Rome, in 1856 ; and as such it could not but be regarded by Greco-Russians, Anglicans, and Catholics alike. Nicholas could have but smiled at his petition, and looked upon him as a learned oddity.

Towards the end of October Mr. Palmer removed to the house of a young priest named Fortunatoff, to live with him in the suburbs, across the Neva. The description he gives of his lodging is somewhat picturesque. “ My room,” he writes, “ is about ten

feet square. A long chest, between two and three feet high, lengthened out by a chair, is the bedstead; on this is a straw mattress; one very narrow sheet and a light counterpane; my carpet bag serves for a pillow, and the scarceness of bedclothes is remedied by my wadded cloak. The window is very small, double of course, incapable of opening in winter; ventilation by opening the door, and by the stove, which is heated every other day and makes the room at first much too hot, fumes from the charcoal often causing headache, in consequence of the wood not being equally burned before the tube was closed. The first night I slept not a wink; when I confessed this to a priest, he said, 'I guess what it is;' and taking a lighted tallow candle, he examined the crevices and corners of the room, and found long clusters of vermin wedged in and hanging together like bees in a hive. They fizzled and fell into the candle, and almost put it out. This clearance is no doubt much, but still my nights are bad enough. There is a shallow round brass pan set on a chair for washing; a great bottle of water, a drinking glass, a candlestick, a small deal table at the window, a second chair and an old cupboard complete the furniture. Cleaning of shoes or washing of linen there is none; but as I went on Saturdays to the English lodging house, and stayed there over Sunday, I used to take my linen there, and get my shoes cleaned, if that was needed."

It cannot, we think, be tiresome to continue this extract, which concerns the diet to which Mr. Palmer was treated in his singular abode. "In the morning, when it was not a fast, the Finnish girl used to bring me a tumbler of tea with sugar—or two, if I called for a second, and a piece of bread; on festivals, sweet-bread, and there was always raw smoked or salted fish, and bread and Dutch cheese—the latter here a luxury, to be had if called for. We dined all together, the priest, his wife, and often a younger sister of hers, and myself, at four o'clock. After dinner they take a cup of coffee, and sleep for an hour or two, being very early risers, and about 8 P.M. we again have a glass, never a cup, of tea. . . . The chief articles of food at table were these: soup, with which we always began, as in France; black rye bread, white bread also; red cabbage, slightly salted, cut into shreds; sweetmeats, made of a coarse berry of a dull red color, and of other berries, which they eat with meat; meat and game, especially ptarmigans, and the largest kind of grouse, the capercalzie, which is very abundant; cakes of millet; a jelly made of potato flour and syrup of cranberries, eaten with sugar and milk. The only vegetable besides the red cabbage and potatoes was small salted cucumbers. On Wednesdays and Fridays and other fast days there was neither flesh meat nor milk, butter, cheese nor eggs; but fish soup and fish, caviare, almond

milk, linseed or nut oil, mushrooms, and several kinds of the edible toadstools. Thin slices of lemon were often put into the tea instead of milk on fast days. To drink there was the water of the Neva, not always over-clear, and quass, and occasionally, on any special day, a bottle of port wine or of porter. *Pirogi*, a sort of sandwich—meat, fish, or sweetmeat, between two sides of baked pastry—and an open tartlet, formed a second course. A favorite and most agreeable drink was infusion of cranberries sweetened, which is also thought to be a specific in cases of internal fever."

It is evident, from many of Mr. Palmer's experiences more than forty years ago, that infidelity was on the move and advancing in those spheres in which it is wont to reign. The priest Fortunatoff told him that in the university the professors and students were all free thinkers, and that the physicians and medical professors and students were all unbelieving to a man. Such sweeping generalizations must always be accepted with allowance, yet it is to be remembered that many of them are German Lutherans, and still more Lutheranised or Germanised. M. Fortunatoff was persuaded that medical men must be skeptics everywhere. "Here in Russia, at any rate," he said, "they are all unbelievers and never communicate in all their lives. Doctors are never punished for being excommunicated. Ah! *Pessimi sunt*." He had much also to say against the nobles, but this may have been due in part to the fact of the priests never visiting them and very rarely visiting the merchants and citizens either. Dispraise of the Frenchified or Germanized nobles was often accompanied by praise of peasant piety. It could not be said of the rural population that they were quite against all ceremonies as superstitions, and that they respect neither the saints nor their *icons*. Indeed there were many mujiks (peasants) who called every unmeaning wood-cut alike *bojinka*—"little god." As to the Russian ladies, Lady Bloomfield says "they never appeared to occupy themselves, and their chief interest was the theatre; their first question invariably was, what plays had I seen?"¹ Whatever way we look, there has been little satisfaction to be found in the condition of Russian society from the years in which Mr. Palmer visited the country, in 1840-41, to the period of Mr. Wallace's residence, 1870-75, on to the time still recent when Muscovite bigotry, cruelty, and avarice were, in their most brutal forms, let loose on masses of unresisting Israelites. Mr. Wallace usually writes with the wish apparently to be accurate and impartial, and he, in speaking of one important part of the ecclesiastical system of Russia, says: "My personal acquaintance with the Russian monasteries is too slight to enable me to speak with authority regarding their actual condition, but I may say that during casual

¹ Court and Diplomatic Life, vol. i. p. 146.

visits to some of them I have always been disagreeably impressed by the vulgar commercial spirit which seemed to reign in the place. Several of them have appeared to me little better than houses of refuge for the indolent, and I have had on more than one occasion good grounds for concluding that among monks, as among ordinary mortals, indolence leads to drunkenness and other vices. If there is anything that may be called party-feeling in the Russian Church, it is the feeling of hostility which exists between the white and the black clergy, that is to say, between the parish priests and the monks. The parish priests consider it very hard that they should have nearly all the laborious duties and none of the honors of their profession. The monks, on the other hand, look on the parish priest as a kind of ecclesiastical half-caste, and think that he ought to obey his superiors without grumbling."

As an instance of severity in civil administration, combined with frightful abuse of a Church sacrament, it may be mentioned that if a man is banished to Siberia for life, after three years his wife is at liberty to marry again. The hollow pretensions of cosmopolitan half-culture, and the sad want of thoroughness that prevails in Russian society, are ably depicted in Turgenieff's masterly novels and novelettes, which all appear in the French language.

Among the most singular of Mr. Palmer's acquaintances was John Veniamineff, missionary to the Aleutian Islands in the North Pacific. He came from Irkoutsk, and his mission was supported by the Russian American Company. Ten thousand of the inhabitants out of sixty thousand had become Christians. The previous missionary, Macarius, had known nothing of their language and had stayed among them only a year. Veniamineff's children were all born in the islands, but at last he sent them with his wife to Irkoutsk for education. In the islands he made all his own furniture; and when he had thoroughly learned the language he translated some of the Church prayers, the Catechism and the Gospel of St. Matthew, which was printed in Slavonian letters. During the first seven years he conversed with the natives and taught them through an interpreter employed by the Russian American Company. His services were in Slavonic, he had a reader or singer, who was a Russian, and a native priest. The people communicated once in about two years, as the missionary could not visit all the islands oftener. Great crimes, it was said, were unknown among them, and they seemed to be the mildest, most virtuous, simple, inoffensive, and submissive people on earth, wonderfully patient, and often going days without food. Admiral Ricard reported one old native to have been supernaturally instructed. Angels in white clothes (whom he called men) used to appear to him. They instructed the old man in the Scriptures, but there seems to have

been some confusion between the words angels and men. When M. Veniamineff came in contact with Mr. Palmer he was dressed in cotton velvet, and wore a gold pectoral cross and a red ribbon. He had a rough, weather-beaten look, but one that bespoke a simple, decided, and practical character. He had forgotten his Latin, and the Potemkins interpreted for him. The conversion of pagans like the Aleutians would be easy if the spoiled children of civilization would only leave them to the gentle influences of the Gospel, as taught in its entirety and purity by Catholic missionaries.

The well-intentioned Veniamineff is afterwards spoken of as a bishop having four or five (Russian) churches in his diocese. Mr. Palmer's interview with the Metropolitan Archbishop of Moscow, Philaret, could, of course, bring but one result. The application was made distinctly, and the grounds were very clearly stated, but this made its essential weakness and untenability the more apparent. Mr. Palmer afterwards admitted that the decision was just. He had no sort of claim to communion with the Metropolitan of the Russian Church, and he had no means of realizing communion with the Catholic Church except by reconciliation with the centre of unity in the See of Rome.

The object of Cardinal Newman in editing the long-buried manuscript of his friend could not have been by any means exclusively ecclesiastical. It has literary merits and social bearings. Some of its descriptions are worthy of any traveller, and present the objects described in a very clear light. Mr. Palmer had been recommended to seek another interview with the Metropolitan Archbishop, and this entailed another journey of 525 English miles. It is far from possessing the exciting interest of Captain Burnaby's "Ride to Khiva," but passages such as the following will always be read with pleasure.

"There is little to notice on the journey, except the long black-looking villages, which lie along the road at intervals. The houses are made of trunks of trees, roughly squared, and let into each other, plastered within, but not without. The gable of the house almost always fronts the road, and the roof, which is of boards and very high, projects some way over the walls, affording a shelter from rain or sun in summer, and shooting off the snow in winter. These houses by no means betoken poverty; on the contrary, they are more substantial, warmer, and larger than any houses of our peasantry in England. Indeed, that sort of poverty which abounds with us cannot be said to exist in Russia. The peasants, whom we suppose to be wretched slaves, answer rather to our small farmers, or copyhold tenants, than to day-laborers or paupers. They have all from sixteen to twenty acres of land, with horse and cart, sheep and other live stock, with a long range of outhouses

running back behind each cottage for hay, wood, and the lodging of cattle in winter. This they hold, free of other rent, by a service of three days' labor in the week to the lord—a service which is often commuted for an annual money payment."

The famous edicts for the emancipation of serfs were issued, it must be remembered, in 1861, just twenty years after the date of the journey of Mr. Palmer here described. He goes on to say:

"The ends of the houses toward the road are a good deal ornamented, and with their high roofs look not only picturesque but pretty, often having as many as three galleries or balconies of palings across, besides an ornamental board or bar just under the angle of the roof. The woodwork of these palings, as well as the projecting edges of the roof and the shutters of the windows, which fold back without, is often much indented and cut, so as almost to resemble a lace pattern. On the other hand, the extent of the out-houses behind, often very roughly put together, and of dead paling between every two houses, all black, like the houses themselves, from the weather, certainly presents rather a gloomy and squalid aspect, and contrasts strangely with the bright, clean, whitewashed walls and green cupolas, domes, and roofs of the church or churches, and with the red-brick and whitewash of the government offices, and perhaps of the hotel. The road from St. Petersburg to Moscow is magnificent in its width and keeping, and in the granite bridges which one passes at different places; but of scattered houses or cross-roads we see absolutely none except here and there perhaps a mere cart rut near a village. Our way ran through two uniform lines of forest of birch and pine, through which a wide space has been cut and left bare. This at the time looked wild enough, but on my return from Moscow it was one vast carpet of flowers of the brightest colors."

Mr. Palmer's visit to the grand old city which Russia once offered for her own redemption caused him many serious reflections on the fate of the Patriarchate and episcopal authority in the hands of the Tsar. When Peter the Great, it is said, had long kept the Patriarchal see vacant, and contemplated the institution of the Synod in place of the Patriarchate, he was one day reminded of his duty in the Church of the Assumption by Stephen Yavonky, Metropolitan of Riazan and guardian of the patriarchal see during the vacancy. "This prelate, pointing to the patriarchal chair, remarked that 'his Majesty might as well have it broken up and removed, if no one were to sit in it,' to which Peter replied: 'That chair is not for Stephen to sit on; but neither is it for Peter to break.'" Thinking of this story, Mr. Palmer, when one day re-visiting this church, saw a man kneeling at the tomb of one of the patriarchs, his hands clasped, his face buried in them, and resting upon the rail which

protects the coffin, absorbed apparently in some deep feeling. The traveller then fell into a reverie not to be wondered at considering his antecedents and peculiar line of reading at Oxford. Was not that worshipper at the tomb lamenting the past, and praying to God "that the government of his country might repent of having withdrawn itself so far from the advice and blessing of the Church; that it may publicly retract the unhallowed assumption made by Peter; that it may return from its eager pursuit after the infidel civilization of the West, and replace itself in that attitude of filial affection and reverence towards the hierarchy it once exhibited under the Tsar Michael, the first of the Romanoffs, and son of the great Patriarch Philaret? or again, may it be that he is confessing and deploring that sinful jealousy which moved the Russian nobility to urge or force their sovereigns in former times to strip the Church of her worldly property, and to break her power, without perceiving that they were thereby destroying that spiritual balance and check which alone secured the Tsar from being a mere despot, or from being a mere representative of base popular appetite or interest, so that the nobles might neither be slaves and tools on the one hand, nor masters of their sovereign under the hypocritical name of his ministers on the other?"

To judge from some little that we have seen of the Greco-Russian ritual, and much more by what we have read and heard, the "liturgy" and other services of its churches must have a certain charm for those who are accustomed to worship in them. Though far less animated than our own, they have an imprint totally distinct from the rationalistic and worldly aspect of Protestant novelties. They are manifestly ancient in their origin, oriental, mysterious and sacrificial in their character. They speak of Christ and the saints, the Holy Mother, and the Jewish Church. Lady Bloomfield has seized many strong points in a page written to describe a midnight Mass on Christmas Eve in the Winter Palace of the Tsar on April 3, 1847. The Emperor and Empress were not able to attend, but "I was allowed," she writes, "to go to a gallery, which commanded a view of the chapel. The body of the church was completely filled with officers of State and the whole Court in full dress. As soon as the Czarewitch and other members of the Imperial family appeared, the service began by the choristers heading a procession followed by the priests, who carried the icons, and these were followed by the Imperial family. After having traversed the principal apartments the procession re-entered the chapel, and vespers began. Soon after midnight the Metropolitan left the altar bearing a gold jewelled crucifix, with which he first made the sign of the cross, and then presented it to the Czarewitch, who kissed it, and then embraced the Metropolitan on both cheeks. The priests wore the

same gorgeous vestments they had on at the christening, and each carried either a folio bound in gold and inlaid with pictures, or else an icon. The Czarewitch approached each and kissed them, as he had done the Metropolitan, and he was followed by the Grand Duchess Maria and the rest of the Imperial family. When the Emperor comes to the ceremony he is embraced by all present, from the first to the last, and this takes several hours; but as this is only an act of fealty to the reigning sovereign, it did not take place in his absence; but as soon as the Imperial family returned to their places Mass was said. People congratulated each other on Christ being risen, and much embracing went on; but I retired about two o'clock, before the service was quite over. The chapel was brilliantly illuminated, and the *coup d'œil* was very fine indeed. When the Bible was read the Metropolitan stood at the altar within the doors; but three other reading desks were placed at the different sides of the chapel, and the priests read from them alternately, which typified the preaching of the Gospel throughout the world."

From what small beginnings has many a great library sprung! A Greek MS. brought by Sophia, wife of John III., from Greece or Italy has grown at last into what is now the Patriarchal Library. The learned Greek Maximus was amazed at its richness when he was sent for to Mount Athos by Basil, the son of Sophia, to sort and arrange the MSS. This was about the time that James II. of England was running his brief career as king. The collection thus made under Sophia and Basil was afterwards enlarged by the Patriarch Nikon, who sent the monk Souchanoff to Mount Athos and to the East, with directions to search all the monasteries, and to bring back whatever he could procure in the way of valuable books and MSS. Souchanoff collected, accordingly, as many as 500 Greek books from Mount Athos, and the Greek Patriarchs supplied him with 200 more. Much has been lost, and what remains needs to be arranged; yet it constitutes one of the richest collections known; and it was said that when the MSS. were catalogued by Professor Mattei, he showed astonishment like that of Maximus at the number and rarity of the treasures unfolded to his view. When, in Mr. Palmer's time, some members of the University of Oxford requested a collation of some MSS. of St. Chrysostom, the collators, M. Kyriakoff and another, courteously declined receiving anything for their trouble except a copy of the New Edition of that work of the Saint in which the result of their assistance should appear.

There are in Russia only three Lavras or first-class monasteries: that of St. Sergius, or the Moscow Lavra; St. Alexander Nefski, or the St. Petersburg; and that of Kieff, where are bodies said to have remained incorrupt about 600 years by reason of their

sanctity of life and singular piety towards God. Cardinal Lambertini, however, held that their incorruption, taken by itself, was not to be accounted a miracle. However this question be decided, the reputation of the three saints just mentioned for sanctity is supported in many ways, and that of St. Sergius owes much to Mouravieff's "Church History" and the notes on it by Mr. Blackmore. He appears to have been a hermit residing in the thick woods, and drawing disciples around him in the midst of all manner of temptation. It was in visiting this Troitsa or great Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius that Mr. Palmer fell in with groups of pilgrims along the whole line of the road from Moscow to the monastery. Many also were returning from Troitsa.

"In all there were, I should think, several thousand, and quite as many women as men. They seemed to wear a peculiar dress of a whitish-brown color, the head, chin and face bound and muffled up in a handkerchief, a jacket or smock covering their body and reaching barely to the knees, while the legs were clad in wrappers, with either bare feet or else shoes of bark, or sandals. Many groups we had passed reclining in the shade of trees and resting, others walking in a body, others scattered irregularly in long lines of twos and threes, and single stragglers at intervals. . . . The outer gates were thronged with a dense crowd of peasants, as were also the courts of the monasteries within, and the avenues of lime trees, and the porches and approaches of all the churches. Many of them asked alms, and there sat along the broad walk and avenues long lines of beggars on either side, many with their hats or caps in their laps, showing in the crowns all that they had received; and some had a good heap of coppers; nor did it seem to strike them that, having received so much, they were any the less likely for showing it to receive more. One man, whose heap seemed one of the largest, being asked to give change for a piece of silver and keep himself a halfpenny, gave the change immediately with abundance of thanks. Some, too, assisted their less fortunate brethren, who were blind, to beg, or turned attention towards them in a very amiable manner. All the pilgrims who had come from any distance had a staff in their hands and a wallet over their shoulders; and many, they said, had walked hither from very distant provinces—some even from Siberia."

The Archimandrite-Rector, Philaret, who was Mr. Palmer's host at the Spiritual Academy, and afterwards became Bishop of Riga, was remarkable for having, in the course of a few years, received into the Orthodox Church as many as 80,000 or 100,000 Lettish Lutherans. These peasants had, during centuries, been oppressed by their German lords, and had little sympathy with their German

pastors. For some time they had been in a state of excitement, and reports had been circulated that, if they would join the Orthodox Church, the Government would improve their actual condition as regarded the lords of the soil, or would remove them, and give them lands and freedom elsewhere. The Bishop of Riga, being complained of as encouraging proselytism, was removed and sent into a monastery, but Philaret, the Rector of the Spiritual Academy at the Troitsa, set to work, as soon as he was consecrated to the See of Riga, and gave a favourable direction to the movement he found existing in the Lettish peasantry. He opened conferences, not without effect, with some of the Moravian pastors, translated the Catechism into the Lettish dialect, and began to translate the Liturgy, or Mass, and to train priests and deacons who might be able to officiate and preach among these peasants in their own language. The complaints of the nobility and their pastors, though strong and numerous, were this time unsuccessful. The Russian Government allowed things to take their course, and, notwithstanding extravagant reports, raised by Prussian and German newspapers, of compulsion, oppression and bigotry, an *oukaz* was issued, which, while it allowed the conversions to go on, provided that no Lettish peasant should be received into the Orthodox Church who had not, six months previously, signed a public declaration of his intention. But, in spite of this discouragement, the movement continued to spread, year after year, and in some places the whole population of a village met together in the church, and took a solemn farewell forever of Luther and his "Reformation." A friend wrote to Mr. Palmer that Count Pratasoff, the Ober-Prokuror, who has been spoken of before in this article, spoke of the conversions in Livonia, and seemed in high spirits about it. "They are going on," he said, "faster than ever; thousands are inscribing their names on the list every month, and the whole number already received into the Church amounts to 72,000." The Government was, for some time, embarrassed to find them priests and churches, and on that account moderated rather than hastened the movement.

Up to the time of Mr. Palmer's visit to Russia, the national character appeared to be tintured with humility, brotherly kindness, warm feeling and reverence, and it is probable that many traces of these would still be observed, especially in the country. Pride and *egoism* will spread among them as they have spread among ourselves, exactly in proportion to the rapidity of the advance of unbelief and democracy. Mr. Palmer gives a few illustrations of this subject which are worth recalling.

"One captain," he says, "in the American service (they are our

children) wrote to the Government that it did not seem consistent with the dignity of a democratic citizen to follow the universal custom to take off his hat on meeting the Emperor. 'However,' said he, 'the Emperor met me in the street, and saved me the trouble of deciding the question, for he took off his own hat to me. I suppose he saw I was a stranger.'" In the "Handbook for Northern Europe," the author, speaking of the Nicholas Gate of the Kremlin, which it is customary to pass bareheaded, says: "Many Englishmen have *made a point of honor* of walking on as if ignorant of the custom, until stopped by the sentinel." We have sometimes asked members of the Established Church whether they conformed on some occasion with this or that innocent Catholic usage, and have been answered with a smile or a sneer,—“Not I.” But this sort of behavior is neither wise nor amiable.

Mr. Palmer was not troubled, like so many of his countrymen, with any pious horror and pity of the icons of the Russians. He thoroughly embraced the doctrine of the communion and the invocation of saints, and had no scruples at all about addressing them with direct, poetical, rhetorical, and spiritual invocations; not, as he very accurately expressed it, “as if they were naturally or bodily present to hear us, but as speaking to them only *in* Christ and *in* God, who may give us for our addresses the same benefit as if the saints were naturally present to hear.” There can be no doubt that this spiritual wisdom, on his part, was among the many causes which led on to Mr. Palmer's entering ultimately the true Fold, and thus obtaining a grace far beyond any which communion with Eastern patriarchs could have procured.

Before quitting the neighborhood of Moscow, the traveller first visited the Monastery of the Resurrection or New Jerusalem (Voskresensk), founded by the Patriarch Nikon. It is very prettily situated on a hill, with groves around, and a winding river. It was an object of peculiar interest; its sacred buildings were a model of the holy places at Jerusalem. “The approach is by a long avenue of trees; its walls are from twenty-five to thirty-five feet high, and rise finely out of the hill, with eight or nine good-looking towers at intervals, and another of rather fantastic appearance, higher than the rest.” There one may visit, as it were, all the holy places, contained under one roof, to which pilgrims resort in Jerusalem, without departing from the neighborhood of Moscow.

The bitter climate of Russia, its long winter and intense frosts, has not deprived it of all natural beauty. When we read this highly intelligent traveller's description of Gortilitsa, a seat which once belonged to the Empress Elizabeth, we well imagine it the fondling of more genial suns and more balmy winds. “The house,

or houses, connected by a verandah, were surrounded by a very large court with a tuft of garden or shrubbery in the middle. The gardens on the other side were in English style, with a deep valley, a trout stream, cascades, fountains, grottoes, and lakes—sometimes three visible at once—hills and woods. Nothing could be prettier. . . . The day before my arrival they killed a huge bear, shooting him as he was splashing the water into his face in the lake. The hills all round the village were covered with beds of strawberries, which the villagers take to St. Petersburg in great quantities to sell. The woods also abound with them wild."

We must now draw towards a conclusion our abstract of this most interesting journey. Mr. Palmer had—as Cardinal Newman well knew—a rare power of building on a slender foundation a magnificent superstructure of brilliant matter. It was on the 24th of July, 1841, that, having taken leave of all his Russian friends in the most friendly manner, and having received from many members of the Synod the strongest assurance of the pleasure they had derived from his visit and conversations, Mr. Blackmore, also, having delivered to him his translation of Mouravieff's "History of the Russian Church" to revise and publish in England, he left for his home, by way of Lubeck and Hamburg, and was in Oxford once more a few days after reaching England. We need not apologize for concluding with an extract from a sermon preached in New York by the late Dean Stanley on All Saints' Day, 1878. The defective character of his theology is admitted, but he was a man of greatness of observation and reflection, and the passage will be found strikingly illustrative of Mr. Palmer's book. He was speaking, according to his wont, of the four Churches of Christendom, and extending yet more widely the tripartite division of Mr. Palmer in his Oxford days. "We know," he said, "how in a family we sometimes see four brothers or cousins, each of the most different character from the other. We might wish sometimes that they were all exactly alike, but God has made them different, and it is their very difference which makes them to be of use to each other. One of them is much older than the rest, grave, perhaps stiff and reserved, unwilling to move; looking at the more eager sports and pursuits of the younger members of the family calmly, kindly, forbearingly; not adding much to their amusement, or advancement, or instruction, but telling them from time to time a word of wise counsel, and telling them of the manners and customs of the good old times, which, but for his tenacious memory and older years, would be quite forgotten. That is the position of the ancient Eastern or Greek Churches, which are found in Asia, Egypt, Greece, and Russia. They have for many hundreds of years done but

little for the knowledge or activity of the world. But they represent, more than any other set of Christians now existing, the usages of older days. They have handed down to us creeds and ancient forms which without them would have been lost. They look upon all younger Churches more kindly and gently, perhaps, than any of those younger Churches look upon them and on each other. They are quite unlike us. We never could adapt ourselves to their religious customs, nor they to ours. But for that very reason we can regard them with respectful gratitude; and the very remoteness of their position and their manners from us makes us feel more forcibly the examples of Christian wisdom and Christian faith which we may find amongst them. Such was the answer of the Eastern Patriarchs in a letter sent to the Pope of Rome: 'Let us love one another in order that we may be able with one accord to worship God.' Such was the letter of the Patriarch of Constantinople a few years later: 'Let us approach the subject which you bring before us by historical methods.' Such, in the great empire of Russia, was the good old Archbishop of Moscow who died some few years ago. Such was the character of the Russian Admiral Kornileff, who fell in the siege of Sebastopol. We see, in all these, features of the same Christian family as ourselves, yet with a peculiar primitive expression, a quiet strength, which we could hardly have found outside of those old Churches. That is the eldest brother of our household." No reader can be misled by the doctrinal error of this passage, after all that has been said of the long and deplorable schism of the Greek Church.

A GRANDDAUGHTER OF JOSEPH DE MAISTRE.

Vie de la Mère Thérèse de Jésus (Xavérine de Maistre), par M. l'abbé Houssaye. Terminée et publiée par Mgr. Charles Gay. Paris: Oudin, éditeur. 1882.

IN the life before us St. Augustine's commentary on the Psalmist's words, *audi, filia, et vide*, seems to be fully borne out. A true intelligence of the truths of the faith breeds piety and spiritual sight after a manner compatible with this world of exile, and on these grounds the granddaughter of Joseph de Maistre of Catholic fame could claim that exuberance of understanding which is early produced in a household where reign faith's powerful traditions. Whether strong natures are born or made is a point which still awaits treatment and development, and whether without that early atmosphere of sound teaching, and hardy nurture in the belief of things unseen, Xavérine de Maistre would still have been the remarkable character which she was, is a question involving the vast subject of native worth as opposed to the outward influences of training and education. However that may be, to the soil must, in great part at least, be attributed the excellence and beauty of the flower.

Marie Xavérine Joséphine Ignace was the tenth child of Count Rodolph de Maistre, son of Joseph de Maistre, the well-known Catholic champion. At the time of her birth, on April 17, 1838, her father occupied the post of governor of Nice, and it was accordingly to the ancient cathedral church of Sta. Reparata in the old town that she was carried, when four hours old, for holy baptism. In privileged lives more especially the child is the measure of the man. The two prevailing sentiments of Xavérine's childhood were love of God and love of penance. The former intensified her natural affections, whilst the latter was the germ which contained the future immolation of Carmel. She seemed, indeed, to love God spontaneously, without any of that painful process which is apt to make souls who are striving after divine delights inaccessible and cold to human affection. Her biographer recounts at one and the same time her devotedness to her mother and her extraordinary acts of penance. Whilst she would leave her play to seek out some heavy burden for her shoulders which should remind her of the Cross, and wear freshly gathered roses with their thorns in her dress, she would also impose upon herself the mortification of not looking at her mother for several hours

together. One Good Friday, noticing that all her family were practicing mortification in some way or other, she was quite distressed to be alone doing nothing. Our Lady, to whom she confided her trouble, gave her an inspiration in accordance with which the child passed a portion of the night in prayer holding her hands crossed over her head. The thought of Our Lord's sufferings pierced her to the heart, and at times caused her tears to flow. On one occasion, a priest who saw her thus, as he thought, silent and preoccupied, administered a sharp reprimand for her sulkiness. Xavérine bore the correction without excusing herself, and was consoled interiorly by grace.

The traditions which Joseph de Maistre had bequeathed to his posterity were worthily perpetuated in Count Rodolph's family. Xavérine's sisters were chosen souls whose lives were guided by the light of faith, and amongst them Francesca, the eldest, was an extraordinary example of penance, one of those whose whole being speaks of little else but Jesus Crucified. Her place would have seemed to be in a convent, yet she had tried her vocation and failed. As a compensation for the religious life she undertook terrible penances, the traces of which she bore on her pale and emaciated countenance. It was to Francesca that the Comtesse de Maistre entrusted the care of Xavérine's first Communion, which great act the child accomplished on March 25th, 1847, that is to say, before she was quite nine years old.

Readers of those delightful pages entitled "Correspondance Inédite de Joseph de Maistre," will remember the aspirations of his daughter Constance and the Count's own preference for the *sublime féminin*. She afterwards married the Duc de Laval-Montmorency, who was consequently brother-in-law to Xavérine's father. When in 1848 Count Rodolph left Nice, he established himself for a time at Borgo, the Duke's magnificent seat in North Piedmont. It was there, on June 20th, that Benedicta de Maistre married Count Medolago Albani, thus making the first breach in the family circle. Her departure from home seems not to have left too great a vacuum in Xavérine's heart, for in her sister Philomena she found an entire community of age and tastes, a sympathy as perfect as may be enjoyed here on earth. After some struggle with herself she determined to share Francesca's arduous work of visiting the poor, and with the impetuosity of her nature she added practices of supererogation to the sacrifice itself. She was not contented with merely going to them. In order to obtain abundant grace for them she would put little pebbles into her shoes, or thorns, which drew blood, into her stockings. Her independence of character asserted itself both at study and at play. She did not like books, and it was only her love of God which made her faithful to

her lessons. "Play is all I care for," she one day remarked in reply to an enquiry as to her favorite occupation. At the same time this very natural bent supplied her with matter for sacrifice. The sisters were fond of acting charades together for the benefit of the family. One day, however, nothing would induce Xavérine to take a part, and she could not be brought to explain her refusal. Philomena at length succeeded in eliciting her reasons. "I found," she said, "that I liked it too much; all the time in church I was thinking what we could do that would be nice, and it distracted me. So, as it prevents me from praying, I intend to give it up." And the child was faithful to that inward light which was perpetually leading the way to penance.

In 1851 the death of the Duc de Montmorency wrought a change in the domestic circle of the De Maistres by giving them a French home. The Duke bequeathed his fortune to Count Rodolph, with all its obligations, but some time elapsed before they established themselves at Beaumesnil, his magnificent Norman château, which supplied Xavérine with a fruitful battle-field. In the meantime Count Rodolph was anxious that his daughters should profit by a temporary stay in Paris in order to go through a course of catechism. Family life as it was carried out in their house was no mean preparation for the discipline either of the world or the cloister. The morning was devoted to study. After luncheon the young girls took their work whilst their mother or one of their aunts read aloud some instructive book. The fine arts filled up the afternoon. It is curious that in spite of the silent pleadings of grace in her heart and of her future vocation, Xavérine, not Philomena, should have been accessible to vanity, but so it was. Humility, wrongly understood, is depressing because it reveals us to ourselves as we should be without God's good gifts, and makes us feverishly eager to cover a nakedness which is more apparent than real. Xavérine had no natural aptitude for study, but she greatly depreciated her capacity, and supposing herself to be very dull, she attached herself rather to her outward appearance. That at least was attractive, she thought, and with truth. When she wanted any matter of dress, her plan was to urge Philomena to ask for it for them both. Philomena, however, had no desires of the kind, and Xavérine would punish her either by a few angry words or a moody silence.

As early as August, 1851, the young Countess Medolago (Benedicta de Maistre) had been taken from her husband and little boy. The Count, in turning his thoughts to a second marriage, fixed upon his sister-in-law, Philomena, as the kindest mother for Stanislaus, and thus the hour of real separation struck for Xavérine. The nuptial ceremony took place in Piedmont, after which Xavé-

rine returned to her home, and for the first time laid herself out in kindness and devotedness to her father and mother. A few months later Count Medolago himself was carried off by cholera, and Philomena found herself at liberty to return, for a time, to her family. Xavérine's attraction for penance was becoming more and more marked. She was no longer satisfied with rising at night to pray, and mortifying herself at meals, but conceived an intense desire to imitate the great examples of austerity suggested to her by reading the Lives of the Saints. Once, in particular, she had been told of the invention of dropping hot sealing-wax on the flesh and allowing it to fester. Accordingly Countess Medolago one day found her practising this penance upon herself, and she was only stopped by Philomena's threat to do likewise.

God's ways are inscrutable. It is not for us to say why He leads some souls rejoicing up the steep ascent of Carmel, and allows others, on the contrary, to bruise and tear their flesh in the thorns by the way. In the ordinary course of things, if we may so speak of the life of grace, penance rejoices the soul, and perhaps we have all been struck by Fr. Faber's remark that the discipline was productive of good spirits. God's reward to Xavérine de Maistre for the ardor of her maidenhood was one after His own Heart. It was suffering, less indeed outward trials than the shadow of her Lord's terrible agony in the garden, interior desolation, the dark night of the soul which has no dawn but eternity. Those who have grasped the full meaning of the law of compensation and in the supernatural order the heinousness of one mortal sin, will alone have the clue to a life such as that of Xavérine de Maistre. As long as there are men and women on earth who live, love, and breathe only for the world and the flesh, there must be others whose whole existence is one act of faith and charity in things divine. Whilst, indeed, the work of St. Vincent's daughters is fairly understood, even by unbelievers, it is not unfrequent to hear Catholics themselves speaking of the purely contemplative life as of a thing which baffles them. They fail to realize the great idea of expiation and to ponder sufficiently upon those words of St. Paul which point out one of the dangers of active good works:

Si distribuero in cibos pauperum omnes facultates meas, et si tradidero corpus meum ita ut ardeam, charitatem autem non habuero, nihil mihi prodest. Who better understands charity than the nun who loves God so well that she sacrifices herself every hour of the day for those whom He loves?

For Xavérine de Maistre the holy mountain of Carmel was all painful. It had only appeared on the distant horizon of her life, and already it seemed to be God's will to take the sweetness, not

only out of created things, but even out of the sacrifices which she made for Him.

As she was driving in an open carriage with her father from Borgo to Bergamo in the early spring of 1856, the horses took fright and they were both thrown. In her anxiety about her father Xavérine forgot herself till she tried to walk, when she found she could not stand on her feet. She was carried to her bed, where she spent three months as a preparation for a state of sickness and suffering which terminated only with her life. In her ardor she began to *desire* that inward desolation of which she had already tasted, as a means of uniting herself more intimately with Our Lord's Passion; and not content with the pains He had laid upon her, she continued her voluntary penances, calling her sister Philomena to her assistance when her own powers of invention failed.

To a soul whom God leads along extraordinary paths a director would seem to be almost indispensable, and hitherto, thanks to her wanderings and her timidity, Xavérine had not met with a guide. It was in Rome, whither the Jubilee of 1858 had attracted the De Maistres, that she first began to be indulged with what is called direction. By degrees she opened her heart to a Canon of Sant' Eustachio, Dom Bertinelli, who continued to be God's instrument in her behalf till the hour of sacrifice had struck. A letter of Xavérine's to her sister Philomena, written shortly before this Roman visit, will convey a good notion of her feelings and state of mind: "*Cristo crocifisso, ed io fra le delizie!* You may say what you like, darling, it's no less true that this ejaculation of Muzzarelli was made for me. Mamma told you about the beginning of my illness, which lasted a week, during which time I did not suffer; but I was warmer than my wont. . . . I stayed in bed six hours longer than usual; my bed was warmed; I lunched, comfortably established on the sofa; I ate a great deal of rice and cooked fruit, because it is my favorite food; at night I drank orange-flower water, kissing Our Lord's wounds and telling myself that He had had nothing but vinegar. I made only half an hour's meditation, and wrote no letters. . . . I say no more, for it would take too long to tell you of all my *delizie*, but this is chiefly what filled up my week's illness. In the intervals I had oppression, shiverings, palpitations. I hope that you won't grumble to-day at my silence about my health, and that you will grow more and more convinced *che i miei mali non son altro che delizie, e vuol pazienza.*"

Later on she writes to the same sister an amusing account of a chance confessor who had questioned her as to her state: "The other day, as I was going to confession, I was asked by way of a hint for my direction whether I was *maritata* or *da maritare*. I

could not help jumping at the latter question, and crying out *no, no, no!* But the confessor, nothing daunted, calmly answered *Dunque è maritata!* I was obliged to say 'No' more decidedly, and then he made me own to being in the first position, for he doesn't admit of a third state. Isn't it amusing?"

It was the March after Xavérine's arrival in Rome that she had the first touch of real desolation. For a week she could do nothing but cry and groan over her misery to God. The thought of confession and Communion troubled her to the marrow of her bones. "I am so bad," she wrote to Dom Bertinelli, "that I wish some one would forbid me the Sacraments." Her director, however, spoke only words of comfort, telling her that her life ought to be a continual thanksgiving for the graces which were lavished upon her.

A little higher up the mountain which was leading her to the laborious rest of the prophets, she made one of those prayers to God which it belongs not to worldly philosophy to understand. Again the terrible drought passed over her soul, taking the savor and the joy out of those things she loved best, and she was moved to offer herself as willing and ready to accomplish God's will with repugnance for the rest of her days. Her prayer was heard. She loved God with the purity of an angel for all the sweetness, tenderness, and even peace of piety were taken away, and in this state of aridity and natural repulsion she accomplished her sacrifices.

In July, 1859, she was taken by her mother and Francesca to Louèche to try the effect of the baths, her father and mother being naturally alarmed at her very deplorable state of health. Louèche was an ordeal. It benefited neither soul nor body in the material sense. Her spiritual nature was as nervous as her physical, and her tendency to introspection was rendered more keen by illness. She could almost have envied the less sensitive mortals she met at the *table d'hôte*, and a voice within her suggested that her sadness took its rise in the austerity of her life. At the end of August she went to Beaumesnil, which she had scarcely seen, and there began an apostleship of good works, whilst every day endeared her more and more to her father and mother. Beaumesnil is a town of five or six hundred inhabitants, a few leagues from Bernay. The Duc de Laval had established there the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul; Xavérine developed his work by the *Œuvre de la Sainte Enfance*, the Sodality of the Children of Mary for the village girls, and the zest with which she labored for the souls of all around her. But, "as for me," she wrote of this period to Philomena, "I am privileged to be weary everywhere and always without cause, or rather with millions of reasons for being happy, for there's nobody on earth who wouldn't envy me my lot *except those*

who have need of suffering and sacrificing themselves for God, for my life is as pleasant as that of an Angora cat or a pet dog."

Unknown to herself she explains her *malaise*. There are souls who are happy only when they are unhappy; the shadow of Calvary is over them, and a pleasant life seems to them a reproach when they look at Our Lord dying on the Cross. In the spring of 1861, at the demand of Count de Maistre, an Italian Jesuit, Padre Santini, arrived at Beaumesnil to preach the month of May. This religious was much interested in St. Teresa, whose works he was translating for Italy, as P. Bouix had done for France. Xavérine was attracted to the Italian Padre, perhaps because he *was* Italian, and he on his side immediately discerned the worth of her soul and formed his conjectures as to whither God was calling her. In a very short space of time Xavérine had transferred her allegiance; fidelity to distant Dom Bertinelli was a small thing compared to profiting by the grace which Providence had so manifestly cast in her way.

Whilst Marie de Maistre, who had married the Marchese Farsati, and Xavérine were "melted into tenderness," as Philomena expressed it, in listening to P. Santini's unctuous reading of an evening, the austere Francesca was gradually bidding farewell to earth. Xavérine, who had gone on a visit to Philomena, at Bergamo, returned to Beaumesnil in time to witness her sister's holy death, and to feel in the strength of her new light and resolutions some of the effects of Francesca's sacrifice. Offering up her sufferings for the Holy Father and the Church, Francesca expired on the 29th of July, 1861, in the odor of sanctity. Penance and detachment had been her distinguishing virtues. Shortly before the end, as her mother was rubbing her forehead with *eau de Cologne*, she said: "Use vinegar instead; it will be cheaper and better befitting a poor creature like I am." Two days later, on the feast of St. Ignatius, Xavérine began a retreat of thirty days' under Padre Santini's direction, to obtain further confirmation from the Holy Spirit on the subject of her religious vocation. The more she became immersed in the solitude of the exercises the greater became her certainty that God was calling her to give up all things for Him. "Francesca," she said, "has gained me the grace to leave home."

Xavérine had no sooner finished her thirty days in the desert than P. Santini prepared to leave Beaumesnil. He had done his work there, which seemed to be rather to show Xavérine the way to Carmel than to preach to its inhabitants. They never met again on earth, but the soul that loves God and has found its vocation, has little need of the creature's help.

How Xavérine, with her wretched health, was to confront the

austerities of a Carmelite's life was not the least supernatural part of her vocation, but her very delicacy furnished her with a means of leaving home and of bearing in her own courageous heart alone the bitterest pangs of the sacrifice. The doctor ordered her to winter at Nice. She petitioned to be allowed to stay there alone, meaning to break herself gently the while from all the ties of flesh and blood, and never to return to the shelter of her father's roof. It was settled that the Count and Countess de Maistre should accompany her to the South and leave her at the house of a relative, the Countess de Camburzano, after which she was to go for a time to the Visitation Convent. Her last days at Beaumesnil were passed in agony at the thought of what she was leaving, but she kept her secret to herself, and saved the feelings of her father and mother. The winter was well over before she saw her promised land. She had almost drained the cup of parting, tasting all its bitterness, drop by drop, during her six months at Nice; but Our Lord was mindful of her oblation, and he sent her always desolation where others would have found their joy. On the 15th of May, 1862, she entered the Carmel of Poitiers. On her way from Nice a priest had happened to find out the end of her journey, and had questioned her as to her motives. "What are you going there for?" he had asked. "To suffer," she had answered.

Worldly romances show us to the door of the nuptial chamber and there close. Why should we seek to penetrate further into the mysterious secrets of the Divine Bridegroom? A few months later, on August 21st, 1862, Sister Teresa of Jesus stood in her white marriage robes at the altar of sacrifice. Her father gave her away and she retired for ever behind the thick veils of Carmel, to suffer, labor, and pray for souls, to lay up gold in the treasury of the Church.

As her girlhood had been, so was her religious life, fuller of the Cross than of joy, knowing rather the thorns of her chosen One's crown than the roses of His tenderness. She was elected first subprioress, then prioress, and whilst she held this latter office she was called from earth at the early age of thirty-three.

Evil times are spreading over us the dark atmosphere of materialism. It is invigorating to inhale for a time the pure air of higher regions, and to know that even in our days God is loved with the entire worship of hearts and with the whole burnt offerings of human lives. Let Xavérine de Maistre and those who have the fortitude and the call to imitate her example trim the fire of penance which is to keep the charity of Christians from growing cold.

THE RAILROAD AND KINDRED MONOPOLIES.

UNTIL quite recently it was commonly believed that our democratic forms of government furnished an all-sufficient guarantee against the domination of any one class of persons, and the consequent depression and subjection of others. It was supposed, too, that no such extremes of riches and poverty as are found in European countries could come to exist here, through which a few persons inherit or acquire, and continue to accumulate, wealth, beyond all possibility of rationally enjoying it, while vast multitudes of other persons are, year by year, sinking down deeper into an abyss of hopeless destitution and misery.

Yet facts within the personal view of every observing person prove that this supposition is a sheer delusion. The conditions of decent, respectable subsistence are rapidly becoming more difficult; they have already become practically unattainable to vast multitudes; and their children have nothing better to look forward to.

Until a few years back, it was the boast of every Fourth of July orator, and of every demagogue who courted popularity, that in this country the variety of pursuits was so great, and the recompense of honest labor so generous, that nothing else but industry and reasonable economy was required to insure a decent livelihood and a competent provision against sickness and old age.

The man who would indulge in such euphemistic exaggeration now, would be set down as either an idiot or an audacious falsifier. In every direction the cry goes up from unemployed millions, "Give Us Work!" It is not *bread* that they demand, but *work*. And the distinction is well worth noting. It is not "a distinction without a difference," but one which carries with it a deep and pregnant meaning. It signifies that it is not alms which the vast multitude of unemployed working-men and working-women in our country demand, but *work*; they do not want to live at any one else's cost and expense, nor at the cost and expense of the entire public. They are willing to work; all that they ask is the opportunity to work. Yet of these men and women who are willing to do "a fair day's work for a fair day's wages," estimates made by different writers, estimates based on a comparison of the returns of the last United States census, with other more recent statistics gathered from reliable sources, concur in the statement that the number of unemployed persons among those who may be properly included under the phrase "working classes," as commonly understood, is about two millions.

Nor is this the darkest side of the picture which facts present. While two millions of persons are clamoring for an opportunity to earn, we will not say a livelihood, but even a bare subsistence by honest work; and while week by week and month by month thousands and tens of thousands of them, disheartened and discouraged, yield to the compulsion of stern necessity, and swell the rapidly increasing number of "tramps," who in summer become a public nuisance and a cause of fear and terror in every rural community, and in winter crowd, beyond their capacity to receive and provide for them, the "lock-ups" and temporary refuges and jails of our towns and cities; while this is the fact as regards multitudes of unemployed workingmen, the cry goes forth from other thousands and hundreds of thousands of workingmen, of working-women, of boys turned prematurely into men, and young girls made prematurely women, by having to face the stern realities of life and plunge into the intense strife for existence, and depend upon themselves while yet they ought to be under their father's and mother's protection and care,—the cry goes forth.

"We have work; we are working; working like slaves, working harder than slave owners made their slaves to work, but we are not fairly paid. Our condition is worse than that of slaves. They are sure of sufficient food by day to keep up their strength, and of a shelter by night; we are not. We work harder than they do, and our condition is worse. If our strength gives out, if sickness or old age overtakes us, our employers, or masters, cast us off with as little consideration and concern as they cast aside a worn-out piece of machinery, and with less of regret or commiseration than a crippled or superannuated mule. We are treated worse than slaves, worse, far worse, than brute beasts of labor. We are willing to work; but we do not receive a fair or just recompense for our work. We do not receive a fair, honest wage for a fair, honest day's work."

That these are facts, and that the words we have put into the mouths of the millions who compose our working classes are a truthful expression in plain English of their thoughts and feelings, every one who takes the trouble to acquaint himself with their condition, and their sentiments, will acknowledge.

And what a satire is not this state of things upon our vain proclamation: "Happy, Prosperous America!" What a commentary upon the pregnant clause of our Declaration of Independence, "That all men are endowed with certain *inalienable rights*," among which are "*Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness*."

What of *Life*, we ask (life in this world we mean, for to that the Declaration of Independence refers, and we do not propose in this paper going beyond the principles of natural reason and mere human ethics), can the millions enjoy, who toil in and about our

coal and iron-ore mines, our quarries and mills and factories, our stores and shops, and yet, who, when each month expires, find themselves without sufficient savings, unless they have stinted and starved themselves, to subsist without employment for one month ahead? What of *liberty* do those persons possess who are absolutely dependent from day to day upon the meagre wages their employer pays them, and who, if they would leave his employ, would have practically to starve for months before they could find work elsewhere?

What of substantial, practical opportunity, or possibility even, to engage in the "Pursuit of Happiness" do they possess who must toil from month to month, and year to year, without finding themselves a dollar in advance of their previous dependent precarious condition?

The truth is, that instead of our growth in population, and our progress in the settlement of our unpopulated territories, and the utilization of our forests, and of the treasures (gaseous, liquid, and solid) in and under the surface soil of our country, marking a corresponding increase of comfort and prosperity to the majority of the people of the United States, they seem, they *do*, indeed (according to the combined testimony of indisputable facts), keep even step with the depression and degradation of vast multitudes, if not of the majority, of the people of the United States.

For the majority of the people of our country, as of every other country on earth, is composed of those who must earn their daily bread by their daily toil; and the number of these is increasing with far greater rapidity than the increase of our population. In other words, the proportion of those who can live at their ease is diminishing, while the proportion of those who are slavishly dependent is increasing with fearful rapidity. In other words, in sardonic contradiction to our vain boast of political equality, and of its supposed consequent, the social respectability of every class and position in society, we have entered upon the road by which "the rich are becoming richer, and the poor poorer;" and we are advancing so rapidly along it that those who work for wages are confronted with the alternative of becoming mere "proletariats," dependent entirely upon the will of their employers for work and subsistence, or else are becoming "tramps" or public paupers.

We are well aware that the substantial truth of these statements is denied, and that they have been widely controverted in various ways. Statistical tables have been framed to show that wages are higher now than they were years ago; that money has a greater degree of purchasing power, and consequently that the condition of wage-workers has improved of late years.

Without diverging from our intended line of thought to refute

these statements, it is sufficient to say that facts everywhere around us prove that they are misleading and fallacious. The increasing misery and wretchedness; the increasing intensity of the struggle for employment; the increasing number of the unemployed in all our cities and towns; the misery that characterizes the condition of our mining regions; the supplanting there of American, Irish, Scotch, and Welsh miners with imported laborers, who are little else than barbarians, and live as no civilized human beings are willing or should be willing to live; these and other kindred facts utterly disprove the assertion that the material condition of the people of the United States, as a whole, is becoming more comfortable, more independent, or happier.

Some of our readers, perhaps, may regard these general remarks as irrelevant to the subject suggested by the title of our paper—"Railroad and Kindred Monopolies." They are not, however. For we directly charge, and it is the purpose of our article to prove, that monopolies are a productive cause of these and other evils; and that chief among these monopolies, and the most pernicious of them, is the railroad monopoly.

When railroads were first constructed in the United States, it was intended that they should serve and promote the same general public purposes which turnpikes, canals, and navigable lakes and rivers promoted, and in a much more efficient way. It was intended that they should be public highways, over which the travel and traffic of our country should pass with like facilities, and freedom of individual action and enterprise, which turnpikes, canals, and navigable lakes and rivers had afforded.

For this reason extensive privileges and powers were granted to them; privileges and powers which are never granted to individuals in their private personal capacity, and which would not have been granted to railroad corporations, or any other corporations, except with the expectation and intention that their powers should be employed strictly and impartially for the promotion of the public interests. The right to charge reasonable rates for the services they performed was conceded in order that the stockholders might receive a fair and equitable return for the capital they invested.

Thus public interests, and not individual or corporate emolument, were the chief and primary purpose of creating these corporations and allowing them to exist. It was never intended that they should control and dominate public interests and become practically independent of the civil authority to which they owe their existence. It was supposed that the limitations of their charters and the established principles of the Common and Statutory Law would be a sufficient safeguard against any such abuse of the powers granted to them.

Contrary, however, to all such expectations, these corporations have become virtual monopolies. Instead of promoting freedom of individual enterprise and action in business, they render it virtually impossible in many of our most important industries. Instead of the public interests being the shaping and moulding purpose of their management, they are managed and controlled entirely in the interests of a few plutocrats, with a view to increasing their overgrown and often ill-gotten wealth, and to this purpose even the interests of the stockholders as well as of the public generally are entirely subordinated. Instead of respecting the provisions and limitations of their charters, the organic law of their being, to which they owe their very existence, they evade them or contemptuously and defiantly disregard and overleap them. They corrupt our legislatures, pollute the fountains of public justice at their very sources, and entrench themselves in the Supreme Courts of the several States, and the Senate of the United States.

These are grave charges, but they are easily proved. To cite all the evidence that might be adduced would be an endless task. It is one, however, which it is needless to enter upon. For, while many of the proofs of what we have said are so hidden and systematically covered over by the tortuous means these corporations resort to in order to increase the difficulties of adducing legal evidence of their malversations and constant violations of law, yet the facts themselves are so notorious and so undeniable that a mere statement of them, or even a bare reference to them, is sufficient to induce conviction.

Accordingly, we pass on to point out the manner and processes by which these railroad monopolies have acquired the enormous powers they exercise, and through the active exercise of which they have not only become monopolies themselves, but have created or fostered other monopolies closely allied to them, and through which they control all the greater and more important industries of our country.¹

¹ One of the plainest and most obvious instances of this is the close combination that has been formed between railroads and all great coal-mining companies, or rather the absorption (in some instances by the railroad companies as corporations, and in other instances by their chief officials) of the greater part of the coal-producing territory of our country. It was never intended that railroad companies should engage either directly or indirectly in the business of mining coal or producing coke. You search their charters in vain for any provision authorizing or empowering them to do this. But what these companies have no right or authority according to law to do, it is notorious they do by in some instances evading the law, and in other instances openly defying it. The entire coal (both anthracite and bituminous) and coke-producing business of Pennsylvania amounts annually, at market prices, to more than two hundred millions of dollars. Yet this immense business, with which railroad corporations have no more necessary connection than they have with the weaving of cloth

I. The first step in this process that we mention, not perhaps first in the order of time, but first as giving practical power to work out their evil results, is that of "stock watering," or in other words, unnecessarily increasing the capital stock of a corporation. It is mainly through this means that the large stockholders and directors and chief officials of railroads have been enabled to acquire enormous wealth, while, according to the official reports of those companies, the stockholders were only receiving reasonable returns on their actual investments.

In this way the public are effectively hoodwinked and deluded. Corporations which started with a few hundred thousands of dollars of actual capital have reaped such enormous profits that they have divided forty, fifty, sixty and in some instances more than one hundred per cent. upon the actual investment. But this fact was concealed from the public by increasing the nominal stock capital to such amounts that the dividends declared seemed to be only six, eight, or ten per cent.

Other and more reprehensible purposes are subserved by this process of watering stock. They are made the means by which a few individuals may enrich themselves at the expense of the general stockholders of a company or of the whole community. A corporation whose original capital stock was, say, ten millions of dollars, may have its stock basis thus expanded or "watered" until it reaches fifty or one hundred millions. And at each stage of the process it may be so managed that a large part of these additions enure to the benefit of a few individuals.

It is not necessary to point out in detail the various expedients and means employed to make these stock-watering schemes suc-

or the making of shoes, is entirely controlled (with a few trifling exceptions) by ten or twelve railroad companies or monopolies sustained by them.

Nor is even this the worst of this matter. Five or six individuals as regards the anthracite coal trade, and about the same number as regards the bituminous coal and coke trade, chatting together in one of their offices, or dining and winning in a private parlor at some fashionable resort, exercise more than dictatorial powers over the aggregate quantity of coal and coke that shall be produced from year to year, the quantities that each region shall furnish, the amounts that each railroad shall receive and transport, and the prices at which it shall be sold in different markets. In this way they crush out all individual operators except those whom they choose to favor, and virtually levy a tax upon the aggregate coal and coke production of Pennsylvania of at least fifty millions of dollars; and of this tax the residents and manufacturers of Philadelphia and adjacent districts must pay not less than ten millions of dollars.

In like manner the transportation and refining of petroleum has been concentrated through the active assistance and agency of a few railroads into the hands of a monopoly—known as the "Standard Oil Company." It was organized about fifteen years ago under a charter from the State of Ohio, and from about \$300,000 at the start, its resources have grown to the enormous sum of upwards of \$100,000,000, while the profits it has meanwhile divided to its favored stockholders, at the expense of the oil producers, and of the citizens of Pennsylvania, have probably far exceeded that amount.

cessful. Our public newspapers are constantly exposing them. But almost always after the wrong has been done. It is well known, however, that the principal part of the immense wealth of the larger number of our railroad magnates has been acquired in this way, while at the same time stock has been foisted upon the public to the amount of thousands of millions of dollars.

In some few instances the earnings of the railroad companies whose capitalization is thus manipulated have been able to pay dividends on their increased stock, but in many instances they have not been able to do it. And it is a significant fact that when the stock had depreciated or become utterly worthless, very little of it remained in the hands of the directors and high officials of those roads. They had worked it off upon the public, and the public has had to bear the loss.

The New York, West Shore & Buffalo Railroad is an instance in point. It was capitalised at an aggregate of \$119,000,000 of stock and bonds. The projectors made a contract with a construction company composed of themselves. According to the terms of this contract they were to receive \$200,000 for each mile of double track and \$100,000 for each mile of single track, in stock and bonds. They did not succeed, owing to the state of the money market and the powerful opposition of the Vanderbilts and their allies, in working off as much of these stocks and bonds as their scheme contemplated, nor at as favorable rates. But they did succeed in deluding the outside public into taking a sufficient quantity to enable them to construct the road without expending a dollar of their own money. Hundreds of deluded purchasers of their stock and bonds incurred severe losses. The projectors lost nothing. The proportion of honest capital to that of fictitious may be inferred from the fact that the actual cost of the work done in constructing the road was \$34,160,000. The amount of bonds and stock issued was \$119,000,000.

The uncompleted South Penna. Railroad is another instance. It is a road which has long been greatly needed by the entire southern tier of counties in Pennsylvania, west of Harrisburg. It would have been built thirty years ago but for the persistent and overpowering opposition of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. Its construction would have given the whole region of country mentioned a direct communication with Harrisburg and thence with Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore and Washington, whereas now their communication is indirect, circuitous, dilatory and at exorbitant rates over various branches of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Its construction would have developed natural resources of immense aggregate value, of "the soil, the forest and the mine;" would have increased the population of those counties and added

greatly to the valuation of their taxable property and thus increase the State revenue.

A late phase in the railroad war furnished an opportunity to construct the road in defiance of the opposition of the Pennsylvania Railroad, by enlisting Vanderbilt in the project. He was approached and consented to invest several million dollars in the project. The remainder of the amount required was subscribed by a small number of wealthy capitalists. But then another element was introduced.

The original projectors had an offer from reliable and experienced parties to build and equip the road for \$10,000,000. On that cost it would have been able to carry freight and passengers from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg and intermediate points, and thence to Philadelphia, New York and Baltimore, at lower rates than the Pennsylvania Railroad, and yet earn much larger dividends. But the projectors were not satisfied with that. Their scheme was to issue bonds enough to build and equip the road, without encroaching at all on the stock capital, which then would represent their profits. In other words, they would make the general public pay the whole cost of building and equipping the road, while they would reap large dividends from stock which cost them nothing.

But even this did not satisfy Mr. Vanderbilt. Like poor Oliver Twist, he "wanted more." Accordingly, the stocks and bonds of the road which could be built for \$10,000,000, were placed at \$40,000,000, that is, \$20,000,000 of stock and an equal amount of bonds. Then, still further, in order to satisfy Mr. Vanderbilt, work, which responsible contractors agreed to do for \$6,500,000, was awarded to a construction company, said to consist of his son-in-law, his clerks and brokers, for \$15,000,000.

Yet even on this fictitious basis—making the public pay four dollars for one that the projectors advanced, and giving Vanderbilt a profit of eight and a half millions of dollars after repaying a temporary expenditure of six and a half millions, the construction of the road would have been beneficial to Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. It would have enhanced the value of property in Southern Pennsylvania a hundred millions of dollars, would have converted into productive farms and prosperous villages and towns districts of country which are now sparsely settled or virtual wastes, and, at the same time, would have earned larger dividends, and at lower rates for transportation, than could the Pennsylvania Railroad, with its enormously expanded capitalization and its many unprofitable extensions.

The construction of the road, however, has been discontinued through illegal action of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the betrayal by Vanderbilt of other capitalists who had put their money

into the road in good faith. The formal consummation of the "deal" was prevented by the action of the Attorney-General of Pennsylvania. But each of the two real parties to it have reaped all the substantial advantages they bargained for. Vanderbilt has gotten the New York, West Shore and Buffalo Railroad, and the Pennsylvania Railroad has entirely stopped, for the time being, the construction of the South Pennsylvania Railroad.

But the instances we have mentioned, of creating fictitious securities and stock, that is, bonds and stock which do not represent actually invested capital, are trivial compared with other instances. Of \$146,000,000, representing the stock and bonds of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, nearly one-half, according to the report of a New York legislative investigating committee, is "water." Of \$160,000,000 capitalization of the New York and Erie Railroad the proportion of fictitious securities and stock is still larger. Of \$259,000,000 stock and bonds issued by the Central Pacific and Union Pacific Railways, it is credibly estimated that less than one-third represents real, invested capital. The Pennsylvania Railroad was capitalized, in 1884, at \$156,000,000, yet the actual cost of construction and equipment was but \$75,000,000. Taking the entire railroad system of the United States, the aggregate of fictitious capitalization, according to Poor's *Railway Manual*, amounted to the enormous sum of three thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven millions of dollars.

A gigantic wrong is thus inflicted upon the public, upon *bonâ fide* individual investors in railway securities, and upon the railway system itself. The practice is demoralizing in the highest degree. It leads railway directors and officers, and the bankers through whom they conduct their financial transactions, to make delusive and misleading statements, and to resort to other culpable expedients to deceive the public, which, when practised on a smaller scale by other persons, would justly cause them to be regarded as common cheats and swindlers.

The newspaper press, too, is brought under these same demoralizing influences. Directly or indirectly, it is subsidized to conceal or varnish over and palliate, or boldly to defend the falsifications, the deceptions and corrupt practices of railroad magnates and their chief officials. They are lauded for their foresight and energy, their skill and enterprise, their sterling integrity, their zeal to promote public interests; they are held up to admiration as public benefactors and model citizens, when it is an open secret that their hands are polluted with bribes, and that they have used the immense influence and power connected with their official positions and their official intimate knowledge of the actual condition and present and future policy of the railways whose management

is entrusted to them, for their own personal emolument and the enriching of their favorites. By these means men who were poor and without financial credit, and whose official salaries were insufficient to make them quickly wealthy, have been enabled, in a few years, to become millionaires.

Not many years ago a President of one of the great railways of Pennsylvania died, distinguished alike for his engineering ability, his haughty reticence, and his autocratical dictatorship. The columns of the daily newspapers were crowded with sickening laudations of his pure and spotless integrity.

Yet, it was notorious that he had given the aid of his name and influence to numerous corporations, and had consented to be placed on their boards of direction in return for gifts of stocks and bonds, in which he had not invested even a dollar.

In connection with his chief lieutenant, and subsequent successor in office, he so loaded down the railroad company of which he was president and virtual dictator, with investments in unprofitable railways that he brought it to the verge of bankruptcy; and an "investigating" committee, which might truthfully be also styled a "whitewashing" committee, was constrained to recommend the relinquishment of all control over a number of these railroads, the sale of their depreciated securities, and the charging to the "Profit and Loss" account of others of them which were utterly worthless. The aggregate loss amounted to tens of millions of dollars.

To what extent these financial blunders were owing to honest misjudgment on his part, despite the extraordinary financial foresight and prudence universally attributed to him, and to what extent they were owing to his being influenced by proffers and gifts enuring to his own personal advantage, it is impossible to know. For, searching investigation into the facts was repeatedly and persistently refused by those who controlled the action of the very stockholders whose interests were thus imperilled and seriously injured.

As one instance of this, a property, represented to be valuable for the coal it was *supposed* to contain, was bargained for by one of the then directors of this railroad for a few thousand dollars and sold at an immense advance to the railway company or one of the mining corporations it had created and controlled—the sale being ostensibly made by the original owner of the land, and the director's interest and profit in the transaction being carefully concealed. After persistent refusal to investigate the fraudulent transaction, the substantial facts were brought to light. Public indignation was aroused, and the director who initiated the "deal" was overwhelmed with denunciations by the newspaper press. In self-exculpation he published an open letter, in which he declared that the

profits of the transaction had been divided with other directors or influential officials of the railway company, who were cognizant of the transaction, and among whom was the President himself; and that, in his attempts to prevent exposure, he had had to part with more than his individual share of the profits and was actually a loser in the end.

Yet the public press systematically refrained from noticing the connection of this "model" railway President, this "pure" and "spotless" and "honored" citizen with the fraudulent transaction.

Surely it is needless to point out the pernicious, demoralizing influence of this upon public opinion and the glaring inconsistency of thus condoning and concealing, or representing even as positive virtues, the corrupt practices of great railroad magnates, while the comparatively petty offences of common scoundrels and swindlers are unsparingly denounced.

But these remarks are divergent from our immediate subject—the watering of railroad securities—though not from our general subject. But to return to our present topic, the fictitious element in our railway policy. The evil is not confined to its being used by railroad magnates as means to build up enormous fortunes for themselves and their favorites, at the expense of the public and of the general holders of railway stock. It extends much further. It imposes an unnecessary tax and one of enormous aggregate amount upon the whole business done over railways which the public must pay in the shape of higher charges for freight and passenger transportation. For, according to Poor's Railway Manual, the amounts of actual and fictitious capital in the railways of the United States are almost exactly equal—each of them amounting in 1883 to upwards of \$3,700,000,000, and probably now approximating \$4,000,000,000.

This enormous amount of fictitious capital having been created and worked off upon the public, it becomes necessary, in order to sustain their credit and the market value of their securities, for the railroads to make corresponding efforts to increase their revenues. To maintain public confidence they must pay annually or semi-annually dividends or interest on twice the amount of their actual capital, that is, on \$4,000,000,000 of actual capital and also on an equal amount of fictitious capital.

The enormous tax thus needlessly imposed on the public may be seen from a few simple figures. Taking the actual investment in railways throughout the United States at \$4,000,000,000 and the fictitious capital as equal in amount (and these figures are approximately accurate), it is necessary that the net earnings of our railways (after meeting all expenses) in order to pay 5 per cent. on both

their actual and their fictitious capital should amount to four hundred millions of dollars. Yet without the fictitious element one-half of that amount of net earnings would be sufficient.

Thus the traffic over our railways has to pay, in the shape of higher rates than would otherwise be necessary, an annual tax of two hundred millions of dollars because of the fictitious stock and bonds that have been foisted on the public by our railway corporations.

And to bring the bearing of this branch of our subject more closely home to the citizens of Pennsylvania: Investigation has proved that the aggregate amount of fictitious capital of the five great anthracite coal railroad and mining corporations is at least two hundred and fifty millions of dollars, while the actual invested capital does not exceed, if it equals, this sum. Thus the anthracite coal business of Pennsylvania is burdened with an unnecessary annual tax, which at 5 per cent. per annum amounts to twelve and a half millions of dollars.

Who pay this needless tax it is unnecessary to investigate. A part, and a large part in the aggregate of it, is imposed on the miners and laborers in and about our anthracite coal mines, in the form of wages systematically kept down to the lowest possible rate. Another large part is paid by every family in Pennsylvania that uses anthracite coal and by every manufacturer who employs it in his furnaces, mills and factories.

The remaining and smaller part of this enormous tax is paid by the consumers of anthracite coal in other States. For, owing to the cut-throat policy adopted by these competing and yet illegally conspiring and combining incorporated anthracite coal monopolies, towns and cities in Pennsylvania in close proximity to the anthracite coal mines (distant not more than sixty miles, and from that to one hundred miles) are compelled to pay higher than in the cities of Baltimore, and New York, and the manufacturing towns of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.

We need not pause, or diverge from our line of thought, to point out the bearing of this upon the industrial interests of Pennsylvania. For it is obvious that it practically places all of them at a disadvantage; and that it practically subsidizes and promotes those of New York and of the New England States.

Suffice it to say, and with this remark we dismiss the subject of fictitious capitalization of anthracite coal monopolies, that the *public* (however and upon whomsoever the tax be imposed) have to pay an unnecessary annual tax of twelve and a half millions of dollars, or else suffer the loss which would be involved in a depreciation of five hundred millions of dollars of stocks and bonds which they have been induced by delusive representations to purchase.

For it is not the railroad magnates nor their chief officials and special friends who lose when their inflated stocks and bonds depreciate. They are in position to see the coming crash and get out of its way before it comes and before the public can get any knowledge of it. Indeed, instead of suffering by the fall in the market price of the stocks and bonds which they themselves have issued, they commonly make another profit out of it. For unscrupulous greed can not only impose fictitious securities upon the public, but it can make enormous profits by artificially causing vast fluctuations in prices, to the injury and sometimes the ruin of innocent parties and the hurt and demoralization of the financial world.

It is this fictitious element that is the chief cause of the frequent convulsions in the stock markets of our great cities and of the general distrust of nearly all railroad "securities." When the business of the country is prosperous and its volume large, railroads can get sufficient traffic at remunerative rates to pay the interest on their indebtedness and declare sufficient dividends upon their stock to keep them at or above par. But when business becomes temporarily depressed, necessitating a reduction of railway charges, fierce conflicts ensue between the different railway lines over the amounts of traffic they shall respectively carry and the rates they shall charge.

Were the capitalization honestly confined to the amounts of money actually invested in the railways, there would be no incentive or occasion for these "cut-throat" contests and railroad wars. For even in its periods of temporary depression the business of the country is sufficient to enable all our great railways to earn fair and reasonable profits on their actual investments; but not on their fictitious capitalization.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, for example, in 1884, earned \$12,621,000, or apparently about 8 per cent. upon its capital stock, amounting to one hundred and fifty-six millions of dollars. But of this stock only seventy-five millions of dollars represented the actual cost of constructing and equipping the roads that made these earnings, and the other eighty-one millions represented investments in other roads. The net earnings therefore were about 17 per cent. on the actual investment in the roads that produced those earnings.

So, too, the net earnings of all the railways in the United States in 1883 were equal to about $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon the total amount of their stocks, bonds, and other indebtedness. But excluding the fictitious element and reducing the capitalization to the actual honest investment at that time (three thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven millions of dollars according to *Poor's Manual*) the net earnings for the year equalled about 9 per cent.

Various remedies have been proposed to prevent fictitious capitalization and its concomitant evils. Some of them are highly

objectionable, as they would prevent freedom of action in constructing new railroads or extending those already in existence. There is a remedy, simple and effective, were it faithfully employed. It is to make it a *criminal* offence for the directors to authorize and allow, and the presidents, vice-presidents, secretaries, and treasurers to sign and issue any stocks, bonds, or other certificates of indebtedness, except for each dollar actually invested. General railroad laws and rigid charter limitations seem good enough on paper, but they are constantly evaded or defied. And this will continue so long as the directors and chief officials of railways are not made personally amenable by fine and imprisonment for their disregard of constitutional and legal prohibitions.

II. Another crying abuse of power by our railway and other mammoth corporations, is their systematic discrimination in favor of certain individuals and certain localities and against others. In this way a few favored individuals are enabled to monopolize certain lines of business to the loss and frequently the ruin of hundreds of others. As showing the extent to which this discrimination is carried, we mention that, in the course of an investigation ordered by the Legislature of New York, it was proved that five firms at Binghamton and the same number at Elmira, obtained special rates from the Erie Railway, varying from five-eighths to one-third of the general tariff rate. On the New York Central Railway it was proved that special rates of 9 cents were given to three dry-goods firms in Utica against 33, 26, and 22 cents charged to other merchants in that city engaged in the same business. The same rate of 9 cents was granted to five grocery firms in Syracuse, while the other grocers were charged 37, 29, 25, and 18 cents on the same character of freight. Four Rochester grocery firms got 13 cents, while all others had to pay tariff rates of 40, 30, 25, and 20 cents. Special rates were thus made to a few favored individuals at twenty-two points between Albany and Buffalo. The special rates at some of the points were but little more than one-third the regular rates; and at one point it was only one-fifth. On cotton cloths the special rate to one manufacturer was 20 cents, while the schedule rate was 35 and 40 cents.

As regards the element of distance the same unfair discriminations were proved. The rate to Little Falls, 217 miles from New York, was 20 cents, which was exactly the same as that to Black Rock, 455 miles; while the rate to Syracuse, 291 miles, was 10 cents.

Like investigations have been attempted in Pennsylvania. But the overpowering influence exercised by the Pennsylvania Railroad over the Legislature and municipal and other corporations throughout the whole State (aided in this matter by the combined influ-

ence of other important railways) has always prevented searching and thorough investigation. Yet, still, sufficient facts have been brought to light, from time to time, to prove that favoritism towards certain individuals and against others, and towards certain localities and against others, is constantly practised.

Through this system vast fortunes have been accumulated in the course of a few years by certain individuals or firms, while hundreds of others have been driven out of business. The vast coke producing business of western Pennsylvania has been made as close or even a closer monopoly than the production of anthracite coal—the control of the entire coke-trade having become concentrated, through this favoritism, into the hands of five or six individuals or firms. As regards coal used for making gas: By a system of favoritism practised by the Pennsylvania Railroad two corporations (whose chief stockholders are officials of that company or their especial friends) have had for years a complete monopoly of supplying, and at exorbitant prices, the Philadelphia Gas Works. And through secret rebates granted to these two companies they have had great advantages over all other shippers and miners of the same kind of coal in all our seaboard markets, from the Delaware Bay and River as far north as Boston. The extent to which discrimination has been carried may be inferred from the fact that the charge for carrying a ton of coal from the Pittsburgh vein, if it be used for *steam*-producing purposes, is \$2.40; but, if used for *gas*-production, the rate is, or was, twice as much.

It is a fact that all efforts to investigate and expose the corruption and abuses of the Philadelphia Gas-Trust have been rendered futile by the persistent refusal of the officials of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, and the minor corporations already referred to, to give any information to the investigating committee on points which involved the favoritism they practised. Thus these companies have aided and abetted the concealment of corrupt and criminal practices by members of the Gas-Trust, if they were not (as there seems to be good reason to believe they were) direct participants in their fraudulent transactions.

Another instance is that of an extensive owner of coal property along the line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. He made a large contract to furnish coal to New York gas-works. On asking for specific rates of transportation, he was told that by an agreement with the Pennsylvania Railroad no coal could be shipped from the region of his mines, for gas-producing purposes, to any point between Delaware Bay and Cape Cod; and a prohibitory rate was established against him. He was compelled to fill his contract by purchasing coal, at a loss of about \$1 per ton, from

mines in western Pennsylvania, and was forced into bankruptcy. His mines were purchased by a prominent director in a third railroad, and this director found no difficulty in getting satisfactory rates.

We pass on to another instance of discrimination and its effects. It is notable alike for the vast scale upon which it was and still is carried on, its success in building up a huge monopoly and its ruinous effects upon an important Pennsylvania industry. We refer to the Standard Oil Company. The production of petroleum is confined almost exclusively to Pennsylvania, the quantities produced by other States forming but a small fraction of the aggregate amount. Yet, through the action of this monopoly, fostered and built up by the direct, but secret, action of four railroad monopolies, prominent among which is the so-called "*Pennsylvania*" Railroad, the State of Pennsylvania and its citizens have been robbed of tens, yes, of hundreds of millions of dollars, that rightfully should have accrued to them by reason of the stores of petroleum beneath the surface of Pennsylvania oil-producing regions.

Some fifteen years ago, under a charter from the State of Ohio, the Standard Oil Company was incorporated with a capital of \$300,000. Whether or not John D. Rockefeller was its first originator, he quickly became its ruling spirit and master. Its chief idea was to so bind the great trunk line railways to it that it could crush out all rivals and monopolize the entire business, both of shipping the crude petroleum and refining it. No evidence attainable by the public exists, by which a full knowledge has been obtained of the methods it employed to carry this scheme into practical effect. Suffice it to say that it succeeded to such an extent that the value of the Standard Oil Company's wealth has increased, in the period of fifteen years, from three hundred thousand dollars to one hundred millions of dollars, and it is currently believed that the dividends it has periodically declared upon its stock have equalled, if not exceeded, the last-named sum. Who and how many railroad officials have been made personally "interested" in promoting this monopoly, is a secret buried in their breasts and in the breasts of a few of the chiefs of this mammoth monopoly. Every attempt at investigation has been successfully evaded or defiantly resisted.

Yet despite all this, enough has come to public knowledge to prove the following facts:

1. That in favor of the Standard Oil Company's refineries at Cleveland, Ohio, and against Pittsburgh refineries, the advantage of 250 miles less of distance (the difference being as 425 miles against 675 miles) of the aggregate transportation of crude oil from the wells to Pittsburgh and Cleveland and of refined oil thence to

seaboard markets was ignored; and the same price, without regard to distance, was charged by the Pennsylvania Railroad.

2. In addition to this publicly declared arbitrary arrangement of rates, by virtue of a secret compact with the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, the New York Central, and the Erie Railroads, the Standard Oil Company was able to sell refined oil in the Eastern markets at less than the first cost at other refineries, with the open rate added.

3. As far back as 1875, a concession was made to the Standard Oil Company of a net rate as low as the lowest net rate to all other companies, with a secret rebate of ten per cent. to that company on *all shipments of oil, whether by itself or by other companies*. Thus, the Standard Oil Company obtained from its allied railroad monopolies a rebate, not only on its own shipments, but also on those of all shipments made by other parties from the oil wells and refineries.

4. These rebates were subsequently increased to the extent of twenty per cent. and more. The exorbitant charges to other parties than the Standard Oil Company may be inferred from the fact that a number of oil-refining companies in Pittsburgh, who for a time refused to succumb to the monopoly, transported their oil to seaboard markets by shipping it 350 miles down the Ohio River to Huntingdon, and thence over the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad to Richmond, and thence by a largely increased distance over all direct routes to the Atlantic seaboard markets. But the contest was too unequal, and the independent companies and firms were compelled to sell out their plants to the Standard monopoly on its own terms, or else retire from business.

5. The extent to which the Standard Oil monopoly was thus favored, to the disadvantage of all other oil-purchasing, oil-refining and oil-transporting firms and companies, may be inferred from the testimony reluctantly given by one of the officials of the Pennsylvania Railroad, that the aggregate amounts of rebates conceded to the Standard Oil monopoly amounted, in the space of *sixteen months, to ten millions of dollars*.

6. The result of this combined dictation and favoritism has been that 95 per cent. of the business of transporting and refining the petroleum product of Pennsylvania is monopolized by the Standard Oil Company; numerous individuals and firms, in Pittsburgh, in the oil regions, in Baltimore and Philadelphia, engaged in the shipping or refining of oil, have been driven out of the business with a loss of millions of dollars, and the greater part of this remunerative traffic has been transferred to the vicinity of New York city.

7. Nor is even this the worst effect of this infamous monopoly,

fostered and strengthened by the direct or indirect influence of three or four of our chief railroad monopolies. By its power to dictate prices to Pennsylvania oil producers it reduced their profits to the lowest possible point; it compelled them to store their oil in its own tanks, or to send it to market, according to its own sovereign will; and to sell it or withhold it from sale as it ordered, and at the rates that it prescribed. It acquired the ownership or control of all the refineries in our great cities, and it so restricted and raised the prices of shipments of oil to European countries that it forced into precocious development and abnormal activity and successful competition with the Pennsylvania oil wells the oil-producing regions of southeastern Europe and western Asia.

We have reached the limits of our space, though not the limits of our intended comments, and must necessarily be brief in our further remarks.

The same unjustifiable discrimination is exercised by our great railroad monopolies in favor of certain localities and against others. As regards the State of Pennsylvania (not to go beyond it for instances and illustrations) the general effect of these discriminations may be inferred from the fact that frequently a tub of butter may be brought at less cost from Illinois to Philadelphia or New York than from central Pennsylvania. Swine and cows and bullocks and wheat and flour are carried to our seaboard cities from Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and even trans-Mississippi States, at rates that are virtually prohibitory to Pennsylvania farmers and graziers and butter and cheese manufacturers. The same is the case with the lumber and the bark of Pennsylvania. A car-load of scantling, boards or shingles will be carried from northern Michigan over the lines of the Pennsylvania Railroad at rates which prevent like products of the forests of Pennsylvania reaching a market. Tanners in other States can obtain their hides from our seaports and send their leather to them at rates which virtually freeze out the tanning industry in Pennsylvania, though a vast supply of the bark employed in tanning is close at hand.

The share of the grain-trade which legitimately belongs to Philadelphia has been transferred to New York through the action of the Pennsylvania Railroad monopoly.

The natural advantages of Pittsburgh as an iron-producing and iron-manufacturing centre, by the same system of favoritism have been ignored; and that business is depressed in Pittsburgh in favor of furnaces at Cleveland, Ohio, and in the Mahoning and Shenango Valleys. The depression in the iron business of Pittsburgh from 1874 to 1878 was mainly due to arbitrary discrimination against it, and chiefly by the Pennsylvania Railroad. Thus the rates on iron ore at the beginning of that period ranged from \$2.95 to \$2.10 if

delivered at Pittsburgh, while they were only from \$1.25 to \$1.00 when delivered at Youngstown. The rates on pig iron shipped from the Shenango and Mahoning Valleys to Pittsburgh or to Cleveland, about an equal distance, showed a constant discrimination in favor of Cleveland of about 56 cents. The total freight charges on a ton of pig iron made at Pittsburgh were \$1.90 per ton greater than if made in the Mahoning Valley, for an equal mileage and amount of handling. On a ton of manufactured iron from the mills the discrimination against Pittsburgh was \$2.23. The total freight charges on a ton of bar iron shipped from Pittsburgh to Chicago, and from the Mahoning Valley to the same point, were respectively \$11.10 from Pittsburgh and \$7.57 from the Mahoning Valley, if by all-rail routes, though the difference in distance is trifling. If shipped by the lake and rail route the discrimination was 50 cents per ton greater.

The glass factories of New Jersey have delivered their products in Chicago and other points on the lakes and the Mississippi River at less cost for transportation than can those of Western Pennsylvania, owing to discrimination by the Pennsylvania Railroad against the industries of the very State which gave it being. Grain and flour have been hauled from Chicago to New York over the lines of the Pennsylvania Railroad at less rates than that road charged for its delivery in Pittsburgh, though the latter is only about half the distance for which the smaller rate was charged. Pennsylvania merchants and manufacturers, in order that they might send their wares to points west of Pennsylvania (in some instances as far as Denver), have shipped them to New York and thence back again past their own warehouses and mills at lower rates than they obtain, owing to this outrageous discrimination, if sent direct from the original points of shipment, though the needless increased haul back and forth through Pennsylvania and New Jersey amounted in various instances to two hundred, five hundred, nine hundred miles.

The effect of this policy of discrimination upon the interests and prosperity of Pennsylvania may be inferred from two facts which we state before bringing our remarks to a close.

In the decade between 1870 and 1880, according to the United States census returns, the aggregate increase in the valuation of farming lands was a thousand millions of dollars, or about ten per cent. Yet, during the same period, owing to discrimination against Pennsylvania products, there was a depreciation in the value of farm-lands in Pennsylvania of sixty-eight millions of dollars, notwithstanding there was an increase in the extent of cultivated land of nineteen hundred thousand acres. And these figures are confirmed by statistical statements recently published in the Philadelphia

Record showing that the value per acre of agricultural products in Pennsylvania has decreased.

There is but one intelligible explanation of this. It is that the products of the farms as well as of the forests and the mines of Pennsylvania are systematically hindered in their natural increase by discriminations against them. The farmers and cattle producers of Pennsylvania are prevented from sending with profit, to markets beyond the State, what they have to sell, by virtually prohibitory rates of transportation. Then, too, their home-markets are stunted in growth by the discriminations made against Pennsylvania manufacturers. The manufacturers north and east and west of Pennsylvania are favored by railroad discriminations in the prices at which they obtain their coal and other raw materials, and favored again by discrimination in the rates of delivering their manufactured products. Then, to crown the injustice and outrage, even the home markets of Pennsylvania are in great degree supplied, through discrimination in favor of the Western States and against the people of Pennsylvania, as regards almost every article of consumption. Grain, flour, feed, butter, cheese, swine, cattle, horses, lumber, and almost everything the farm or forest can produce, are delivered at lower rates from far distant points than Pennsylvania land-owners can have them transported for. Is it any wonder that Pennsylvania is not prospering to the extent that might reasonably be expected from its natural advantages? Any wonder that population increases slowly and business of every kind, whether agricultural, manufacturing or mercantile, moves sluggishly?

The second fact we state, and it is the last we shall cite, confirms the one we have just commented on. Ever since the Pennsylvania Railroad (in order to monopolize the railroad business between Philadelphia and New York) acquired virtual ownership of the United Railroads of New Jersey, and so, too, ever since it acquired (for a like purpose) its systems of railroads west of Pittsburgh and Erie (extending to Cleveland, Northern Michigan, Chicago, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis and other points), it has lost, if its official reports are true, from one to three million dollars annually, sometimes on each and sometimes on both of its railroad systems, east and west of Pennsylvania. And year by year the Pennsylvania Railroad officials congratulate the stockholders, assuring them that, though their railroads through New Jersey and their railroads west of Pittsburgh and Erie have been operated at a loss, yet the profits on local freights to and from Pittsburgh to Philadelphia and intervening points not only have made up these losses, but have earned sufficient profits over and above them to pay fixed charges and justify a dividend.

Now, what does this mean? It means simply this, that by exorbi-

tant charges upon the business of the people of Pennsylvania, who are almost entirely shut out from the use of other railroads, the Pennsylvania Railroad gives *premiums* to the people of other States and carries their products at unremunerative rates, and then imposes the loss upon the people of Pennsylvania; thus actually making them to pay, in the shape of needless and oppressive charges, for the discriminations which the very railroad they gave corporate existence to and generously sustained through all the difficulties of its earlier existence, exercises in favor of other States and against Pennsylvania.

The aggregate amount which the people of Pennsylvania have thus paid up to the present time (as any one can verify—if he can get the successive annual reports of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company for the last twenty years) is not less (and probably much more) than from thirty to forty millions of dollars.

Pennsylvania is equal in geographical extent to the State of New York. It has a more genial climate, and a vastly greater quantity of land capable of being made productive. It is the first State in the Union as regards its quantities of coal and iron-ore. It has a monopoly of anthracite coal, and a virtual monopoly of petroleum and of supplies of natural gas. It is nearer to the southern seaboard States, both by water and by rail, than New York. It is nearer to the great West and Southwest. It is no farther from the vast Northwest. Its people are unexcelled for persistent energy and industry and thrift. Its chief city has direct water communication with every country whose shores abut upon the oceans of the world. Its second city is at the head of a system of river navigation that extends from St. Paul on the north to the Gulf of Mexico on the south, and westward to the Rocky Mountains. No other State has greater or equal natural advantages. We believe that if these advantages were properly and energetically utilized, Pennsylvania would be in population the first State in the Union. Yet Pennsylvania is not growing either in population or in wealth, or as regards its industrial activities, either agricultural or manufacturing or commercial, as rapidly as it might and should. And why? We can find no other answer than that Pennsylvania has given itself over to the control of monopolies, chiefly of railroad monopolies, and chief among them has been and continues to be the Pennsylvania Railroad. They are repressing the energies of her people, are making their exertions unprofitable, and are steadily transferring her natural increase and her natural industries to other regions naturally less favored.

THE ELECTIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRISH HOME RULE.

THE results of the recent elections in Great Britain and Ireland furnish cause to friends of Ireland and of Ireland's rights, not for chagrin or disappointment, but for congratulation. All the antecedents of the elections, taken together, form a chapter in British Parliamentary history, and a chapter, too, in the long contest, and the progress of the contest towards a happy termination, of Irish aspirations for right, justice, liberty, freedom, against British oppression, injustice and tyranny, which can never be blotted out.

The long, protracted, exhaustive debate in the House of Commons, which resulted in the dissolution of Parliament and the ordering of a new election, demonstrated, beyond all possibility of successful denial or even question, the justice and the necessity of conceding to the people of Ireland the liberty of legislating for the promotion and protection of their own rights and special interests; a necessity, too, which was intertwined as closely with the true interests of Britain as with those of Ireland.

The discussion, both on the floor of the House of Commons and outside in newspapers, and periodicals, and letters, and pamphlets, scattered broadcast through the British Islands, demonstrated also that the motives and arguments against Home Rule for Ireland grew out of a mean and selfish and, in no small degree, malicious combination of landlord greed, aristocratic pride and traditions, Orange bigotry, English stupidity, obstinacy on the part of their squirocracy and their agricultural laborers, personal jealousy of Mr. Gladstone, and personal vain ambition and desires to acquire notoriety, if not fame or power, on the part of a number of sentimental, but unprincipled, professed Radicals and Liberalists. On the other hand, it clearly and irrefutably proved that the demands of the people of Ireland were supported by the whole history of the relation of Britain to Ireland, by natural and divine law, by human consciousness of the eternal principles of right and justice, and by every intelligent comprehension of the real and true interests of the people of Great Britain as well as of Ireland. These facts are now of record and can never be blotted out.

A new election of members to the House of Commons was ordered, and the elections have been held. The results of this election we shall discuss in a subsequent paragraph. During the canvass the opponents of Mr. Gladstone and of his Home Rule proposal spared no means, legitimate or illegitimate, justifiable or base

and contemptible, to mislead and delude the people of Britain. Persuasion, corruption, intimidation, vilification, were unhesitatingly and unscrupulously employed. Old and stale slanders against the people of Ireland were revived. Traditionary prejudices, on the point of expiring, were warmed into new life and activity. Religious prejudices were appealed to, and political and personal falsehoods were disseminated broadcast. Churchill did his utmost to stir up riots and open rebellion in the north of Ireland, hoping that the consequent confusion would bring about a summary withdrawal from Ireland of even the partial rights its people possessed. His efforts, happily, failed, and, if *British law* against treason had been enforced, he would have been consigned to the Tower of London.

In view of all this, it is a wonder that opposition to Home Rule did not sweep over all Britain as fire sweeps through stubble or the dried leaves of a pine forest in summer.

Moreover, there was a combination of other incidents and circumstances against the friends and in favor of the enemies of Irish Home Rule, which the latter did not neglect to effectively employ. The recent Acts, for the extension of the franchise and for the redistribution of seats in Parliament, were, as yet, very imperfectly understood by "the masses" in England who thus had obtained the privilege of voting. They were scarcely conscious of their newly-acquired power, or, if conscious, they knew not how to use it effectively. For "*Hodge*," the traditional epithet applied to the English agricultural drudge, is the slowest to move or change, the stupidest, the most stolid and obstinate creature that breathes and lives, in human form, on the face of the earth. We say "*English*," with deliberate purpose and meaning, excluding the Scotch and Welsh. And, the *English* toilers in mines and mills and factories are little better.

They neglected to register as voters; or, moving into other election districts, they registered, and were deluded into registering in districts where they had no right to vote. Then, too, the elections were held in the harvest season. The owners or holders of the land are Tories, Whigs, or *Plutocrats*, opposed to Irish Home Rule. They shrewdly and systematically drove on their harvest-work, refusing any cessation or interval to the laborers they employed. Thus they compelled them to lose their votes by staying away from the polls.

It was in this way, with all the power of wealth and pride of station and of class, with bold intimidation and reckless falsification, and pandering to the basest passions of fallen humanity, that the defeat of Gladstone was accomplished.

But, before that defeat could be obtained, and a seeming victory

won by the combined Tories, the Whig landlords and the recalcitrant Radicals, declarations and promises had to be made by Hartington and Chamberlain, and their respective followers, of willingness to do justice to Ireland and grant local government; promises which, "like chickens and curses," will "come home to roost" on the heads of those who made them, whether sincerely or with deliberate intention to deceive.

It were useless to fight the battle over again by recounting what reputations were hopelessly wrecked, what aspirants to political influence, power or office went down upon the field, killed or sorely wounded.

Suffice it to say that, throughout the whole conflict, Gladstone towered above all his foes, and proved himself as often before—

" No carpet knight, so trim,
But in close fight a champion grim,
In camp a leader sage."

Never, in any previous conflict, throughout all his long and varied career, did he bear himself so knightly and so nobly. Who were struck down by the sword of his keen logic, who were unhorsed by the spear of his resistless arguments, it is needless to mention. It is enough to know that, of all the members of his Cabinet, of any note, who refused to accept his proposal to grant Home Rule to Ireland, and followed Chamberlain into the "cave" of English Radical dissidents, the only survivor is Chamberlain himself. And he, after going down into the gutter or the cess-pool, to gather dirt with which to bespatter Gladstone and his supporters, must now strive to emerge from it, hoping, but vainly hoping, that he may cleanse himself from the filth with which he has besmirched himself.

To any one who thinks of the attitude of the people of Great Britain only two or three years ago, the results of the election just concluded are scarcely credible; and scarcely credible, too, are the events which, rapidly following each other, compelled that election to be held.

It seems only yesterday that Parnell and his little band of followers were refused a hearing by the House of Commons, were suspended and expelled amidst yells and jeers, were politically and socially ostracised; since most of them were imprisoned in Kilmainham jail; since, of the six hundred and seventy members of the House of Commons, only thirty-five or thirty, or even a less number, of its members could be relied upon to stand resolutely, in face of overwhelming opposition, advocating demands of the Irish people that involved not one-tenth of what Mr. Gladstone's proposals foreshadowed. In this stubborn unreasoning opposition, Tories, Whigs and factionists of every shade and color, both in Britain and from

Ireland (from Ireland, but not of her), were combined without regard to party lines. And one among them was William Ewart Gladstone; and sometimes he was foremost of them.

But on the morrow, as it were, with no other aid than the power of common natural justice, the awakened intelligence of the people of Ireland to their inalienable rights, their contributions from their own scanty savings, and the assistance sent from America and Australia by generous liberty-loving men and women, Parnell, representing the people of Ireland and followed by them, wrung from Whigs and Tories and Orange bigots enough Parliamentary seats to go into the House of Commons with eighty-six members "good and true" pledged to Home Rule.

By him and his faithful followers the Liberals were punished by arraying the Irish vote in Britain against them; and by him and his following the Tories were, in turn, summarily ousted from their short-lived possession of power.

The Liberals, with Mr. Gladstone as their leader, profited by the lesson taught them, and applied themselves to the study of principles of right and justice. The result was the introduction of the Gladstone Home Rule and Land Purchase Bills for Ireland. The House of Commons was unprepared for such proposals. Even prominent followers of Gladstone, and even members of his Cabinet stood aghast. Chamberlain, Goschen, Trevelyan, and others of less note openly rebelled. The Bills were rejected; the one being withdrawn and the other voted down.

It was not strange. It would have been strange indeed if it had not so happened. The House of Commons, the Government and people of Great Britain were asked by Mr. Gladstone, without previous warning or education, to give up the traditionary ideas and prejudices in which for successive generations and hundreds of years they had been brought up and schooled; asked to confess that the whole history of their dealing with Ireland for long centuries was a record of crime and cruelty which they ought to hasten to ask forgiveness and do penance for.

The Gladstone Cabinet resigned, and a dissolution of Parliament and a new election necessarily followed.

And now that the immediate contest is over what is the outcome? We will not enter into details of particular districts won or lost, but simply give the grand result.

Of the six hundred and seventy members that will make up the new House of Commons

317 are Tories,
74 "Unionists" (Whigs or Recalcitrant Liberals),
194 Gladstone Liberals,
85 Followers of Mr. Parnell.

670 in all.

Is there anything in this to discourage the people of Ireland, or their friends and sympathizers in America and other countries? On the contrary, there is every reason to rejoice and redouble effort. Two hundred and seventy-nine members (followers respectively of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell) will enter the House of Commons pledged to Home Rule. Two hundred and seventy-nine in comparison with thirty or thirty-five a year or two ago. Moreover, many of the "Paper Unionists" and some even of the Tories loudly proclaimed that they were not opposed to granting local self-government to the people of Ireland; they were only opposed to Mr. Gladstone's proposed methods and measures. All of them—if their blatant professions were to be believed—loved Ireland and were willing to do her justice. Their love, however, was of different degrees of intensity and proportions. Some loved her very much, and were willing to do anything for her except vote for the Gladstone Bill. Others loved her not quite so much, but were willing to grant her an instalment of justice and a shadow of local county government. But all loved Ireland sincerely; only they did not wish to disintegrate the British Empire. On this string they harped and pleaded and besought the people of Britain to save the Empire from certain destruction by voting for them at the polls. They assured their constituents that they, if elected, would do justice to Ireland by wiser and more effective legislation than Mr. Gladstone had proposed.

The men who made these promises and declarations have defeated Mr. Gladstone; rather, they have seemingly defeated him by acquiring a numerical majority in the House of Commons. But he survives, and, apparently invigorated and made more determined by his overthrow, he will re-enter the House of Commons prepared to battle more resolutely than before for Irish Home Rule.

Then, too, Home Rule has not experienced even a shadow of defeat. The electioneering canvass compelled, as we have just said, numerous candidates opposed to Mr. Gladstone to declare themselves in favor of Home Rule. Their declarations, sincere or insincere, will be remembered. They will have either to make them good, or else to eat their own words, and stand before the public as having obtained seats in the House of Commons by false pretences.

Meanwhile, the English people are being rapidly educated up to an intelligent comprehension of the Home Rule question. The late election contest itself has had a wonderful effect for good in this way. And though the elections are now over, the discussions in newspapers and periodicals over their results and over Irish questions which still occupy a foremost place in public attention, and the debates which are sure to arise over these same questions

in the coming session of Parliament, will continue this educational process.

The rapidity and extent to which public opinion has been brought up to the point of looking upon the granting of Irish Home Rule as a practicable and necessary measure is proved by the smallness of the majority by which the Tories aided by the Liberals defeated Mr. Parnell. It requires only a very slight change in *English* opinion to throw the majority of votes in favor of it instead of against it. We say *English* opinion; for Wales and Scotland have already been won over.

Whether the Tories will undertake to introduce a Home Rule Bill of their own fashioning at the coming session of Parliament, remains to be seen. We regard it as improbable; though they will have to attempt, in some way or other, to legislate on Irish questions. Whatever shape this attempt will take, it will have the effect of demonstrating more clearly and fully the justice and necessity of giving the people of Ireland legislative Home Rule.

There is only one thing that can prevent this, or seriously delay its attainment. It is violence and illegal action on the part of professed friends and supporters of the people of Ireland. If the Irish people and their friends, both in and out of Ireland, are quietly and calmly resolute, and abstain from illegal action, the movement, which has acquired such immense momentum, must and will advance rapidly to a happy consummation.

Meanwhile the importance of Ireland's receiving moral and material assistance from the people of the United States still remains. To the assistance generously furnished up to this time is owing, we believe, in great part, the rapid progress, during the last few years, made by the people of Ireland towards gaining their just rights and liberties. Let this assistance be continued, and ere long Ireland will win Home Rule.

Scientific Chronicle.

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS OF THE SIGNAL SERVICE.

To the courtesy of General W. B. Hazen, Chief Signal Officer U.S.A., we are indebted for the information which enables us to present to our readers a brief summary of the remarkable and progressive work which has been accomplished by the Signal Service Corps.

All are, without doubt, well aware of the fact that the U.S. Signal Service is a special branch of the army that has for its immediate object the "two-fold duty: (1) of providing an efficient corps charged with the work of opening and maintaining communication at the front in time of war; and (2) of noting the development and progress of storms and other meteorological phenomena, and reporting the same to the public with predictions of probable future atmospheric conditions."

It is beyond our present purpose to dwell upon the first of these duties, as our sole desire is to draw attention to the thoroughness of the scientific work accomplished in Meteorology, and to the immense benefit which the nation has derived from the patient labor and timely notifications issued from this Bureau.

As a proof that the Signal Service Corps possesses in the highest degree the entire confidence and esteem of the country, we may produce the following extract from an address of the President of the Geographical Society, Chief Justice Daly: "Nothing in the nature of scientific investigation by the National Government has proved so acceptable to the people, or has been productive in so short a time of such important results, as the establishment of the Signal Service Bureau."

In fact, not only has it answered the purpose had in view by Congress when, in 1870, the Signal Service was charged with the duty of taking meteorological observations in the interest of agriculture, but in reality it has done much more. Besides notifying the public of the daily atmospheric conditions prevailing throughout the entire area of the United States, this bureau sends forth "forecasts" which are of the utmost importance to the commerce and agriculture of the nation. To planters, stockraisers, shippers and merchants, in a word, to nearly every class of business men, these "forecasts" have become almost indispensable auxiliaries in their various commercial transactions. Thousands of dollars' worth of property has been secured against loss, and valuable crops preserved from injury by these timely warnings of approaching storms, frosts, and floods. "Had we, a quarter of a century ago," writes a British meteorologist, "known the rigor of the Crimean climate, who would have dared to send out an army unprepared to meet the hardships of a Black Sea winter? The fact is," continues the same writer,

"there is not a profession, not a handicraft, not a process in animal or vegetable life which is not influenced by meteorological changes."

In order to obtain an idea of the manner in which these valuable results are obtained, let us examine in detail the method employed by the Signal Service Bureau in the preparation of the familiar Weather Charts.

Each day the first labor is devoted to the weather predictions, including storm warnings. These predictions, which are based upon the results of three simultaneous reports telegraphed to Washington from all parts of the United States and Canada, are issued three times every day, under the title of "Indications" and Cautionary Signals.

The number of stations from which telegraphic reports are thrice a day received at the central office is 135.

In addition to these, there are 157 stations from which single daily reports are transmitted; of this class, 12 are situated in the Dominion of Canada. If we include special stations, the total number from which observations were forwarded to Washington on the 30th of June, 1884, was 464.

"These observations include the reading of the barometer and the dry-bulb and wet-bulb thermometer; the direction and velocity of the wind; the amount of rain or snow fallen since last report; the kind and amount, the velocity and direction of movement of the clouds," and other minor observations. From these data are compiled what are termed the "Weather Maps."

On these maps "all the Signal Service Stations are entered in their appropriate geographical places, and annexed to each station are the figures expressing the reading of barometer and thermometer" and the results of the other observations enumerated above.

The relations existing between observations taken at the different stations are made apparent by means of figures and symbols, as well as by lines which are drawn so as to group the geographical areas throughout which like conditions of weather prevail. Armed with this charted material, the officer preparing the predictions, proceeds first to compile the "Synopsis," and then to deduce the "Indications," and issue the necessary storm warnings. The "Synopsis," "Indications" and Cautionary Signals constitute the press report. The average time elapsing between the simultaneous reading of the instruments at the various stations and the issue of the "Synopsis" and "Indications" has been calculated at one hour and forty minutes.

Truly the nation has just cause to feel proud of the efficiency attained by this branch of the public service. A single evidence of the wonderful accuracy of the "Indications" will suffice to show how worthy they are of the confidence reposed in them. For the year ending January 30th, 1883, the percentage of verifications was nearly 90! A brilliant record indeed, and a most gratifying proof of the skill and devotedness of those to whom this trust has been confided.

Regarding the diffusion of these reports, we find that the Bureau endeavors to make them accessible to all. No less than 1095 weather

forecasts are daily telegraphed from the central office to all the principal points in the United States. Cautionary storm signals, which form a very important part of the Signal Service duty, are issued three times a day. "The total number of sea-ports and points on the great lakes and sea-coasts where the storm signals are shown is one hundred and eleven."

We may add a few words on the "International Weather Bureau." Some readers may have been surprised of late at the fact that General Hazen urged before the Congressional committee the necessity of establishing foreign stations with American observers: Large as is the area of our country, it is impossible to study fully the movements of storms without observations covering a much greater portion of our hemisphere, and taken at the same moment of actual time. This object is already in great part accomplished by the international exchange of observations.

The beginning of this work dates no further back than 1870. Previous to the introduction of the system of simultaneous weather reports in the United States by General Meyer, the simultaneous observations taken in any country were comparatively few. "When in September, of the year 1873, an International Meteorological Congress was convened at Vienna—an assemblage composed of the official heads of the meteorological bureaus of the different powers—an original proposition was made by General Meyer, as the Chief Signal Officer of the United States Army, looking towards a world-wide scheme of weather research. General Meyer's proposition was to this effect: 'that it is desirable, with a view to their exchange, that at least one uniform observation, of such a character as to be suited for the preparation of synoptic charts, be taken and recorded daily at as many stations as practicable throughout the world.'"

The Vienna Congress was unanimous in its approval of General Meyer's proposition; and after its adoption by this Congress, and through the courteous coöperation of nearly all the governments of Europe, General Meyer was not long in gathering all the necessary means for putting it into practice. Hence we find that a year had not elapsed from the time the Vienna Congress joined in the resolution, when the exchange of simultaneous reports became sufficiently numerous to admit of making the daily "Weather-Bulletin and Chart"; and on January 1st, 1875, was commenced the regular daily publication, from the Signal Office, of the "Bulletin of International Simultaneous Meteorological Observations, of the Northern Hemisphere." In this bulletin were presented the tabulated results of simultaneous weather reports from all the coöperating observers.

The reports embrace "the combined territorial extent of Algiers, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Central America, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Greenland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunis, Turkey, British North America, the United States, the Azores, Malta, Mauritius, the Sandwich Islands,

South Africa, South America, and the West Indies, so far as they have been placed under meteorological surveillance."

In furthering this grand project, the Signal Service has the coöperation of the British, Portuguese, Swedish, and American navies, and hence the daily Bulletin issued from the Signal office gives news also of the great ocean highways, "on which ships of all flags take observations while en route from port to port." The number of those engaged in taking marine observations is 481; and all navigators are requested to contribute to this work whenever opportunity for so doing may present itself. And indeed there are numerous opportunities for the navigator to be of the greatest utility to the service. Did we need illustrations of this, or instances in which even the most unpleasant trials of the seaman's life may be a golden opportunity for doing a vast deal of good, we might cite the example of the steamship "Faraday." The instance is thus briefly narrated: "The steamship 'Faraday,' when laying the last Atlantic cable, encountered a severe cyclone in mid-ocean, which, without heaving to, she reported by her telegraphic wire to Europe, noting the successive changes of wind as the different quadrants of the storm passed over her; thus indicating to those on land the direction and progressive velocity of the gale, so that they could calculate the time and locality at which it would strike upon the European coast." Other instances might be mentioned did the space allowed us permit our so doing. In a word, the international weather service is looked to as the great hope of the meteorology of the future.

RECENT PROGRESS IN THE METALLURGY OF ALUMINIUM.

At length the time seems to have arrived when Aluminium can assume its proper rank in the industrial arts, and displace iron and other common metals in many of the uses to which they are now applied. Next to oxygen and silicon, Aluminium is the most common element in nature. Constituting the base of most rocks and soils, of clay, marl and other minerals, this metal is even more abundant than iron, and forms no less than a twelfth part of the solid crust of our globe. While occurring so commonly, Aluminium has exceptionally valuable properties. It remains untarnished in the air even when heated or exposed to sulphurous vapors; it is not attacked by vegetable acids; it is highly sonorous, malleable and ductile, and may be cast in sand or iron moulds; it conducts electricity as well as silver; and while extremely light, forms with other metals alloys remarkable for their great tensile strength, their beautiful color, and other properties.

Hitherto this metal has been but sparingly employed for practical purposes, as its metallurgy was difficult and expensive. In fact, the pure metal was scarce from the time of its discovery by Wöhler until the year 1854, when Professor Henry St. Claire Deville devised an im-

proved method for its extraction ; since then it has been produced on a larger scale, but its price was never less than \$10.00 per pound. Within the last few months, however, two new methods have been discovered which, it is claimed, will reduce its price to somewhat less than \$2.00 per pound. Though at first this price seems still rather high, it is relatively only a little greater than that of tin at fifty cents per pound, since for equal weights the bulk of this metal is only about one-third that of Aluminium.

In our issue of January last we gave the outlines of one of these methods, viz.: the method of Messrs. Cowles, of Cleveland. Since then their process has been much improved, as may be gleaned from the communication of Professor T. Sterry Hunt, of Montreal, to the National Academy of Science, in the April meeting at Washington. By increasing their plant, the Cowles Bros. have reduced the cost of Aluminium bronze to thirty cents per pound. They have also succeeded in making alloys with iron, silver, and other metals, and have obtained from these alloys pure Aluminium by sublimation and reduction.

At present we wish to note merely the second method, which has been devised by an eminent chemist of New York City, Mr. H. Y. Castner.

This method is substantially the same as that of Deville. As is well known, the Deville process involves three distinct stages: in the first, Alumina or Aluminium oxide is obtained from clay or corundum; in the second, from this oxide the chloride is prepared; in the third, the chloride is reduced by metallic sodium. The expense of the third stage, owing to the high price of sodium, reaches about 75 per cent. of the cost of the whole process.

Mr. Castner has succeeded in lowering the cost of this third stage by reducing the price of sodium from \$5.00 to twenty-five cents per pound. The other stages of the process, however, remain unchanged, though these will now be worked at a smaller expense, as Aluminium will be produced on a more extended scale.

As yet the patents of this invention have not been issued for foreign countries, hence Mr. Castner is unwilling to publish the precise nature of the new process for preparing cheap sodium. From what is known at present, it appears that the chemical reactions, by which this preparation is effected, are quite different from those of the old method proposed by Brunner in 1808. The general working of the process still remains the same with the exception of the following improvements: The temperature at which the metal is distilled being much lower than before, most of the danger accompanying the old process is avoided, and at the same time the large iron crucibles in which the distillation takes place last longer. Besides, the full yield of metal is obtained from each charge, and the operation is rendered easier by an ingenious contrivance which allows the crucible to be automatically raised through apertures in the bottom of the furnace. We may add that Mr. Castner's method of preparing sodium, apart from its utility in the production of cheaper Aluminium, is very valuable in itself. Pure sodium enters

largely into the industries, and is employed in the preparation of pure magnesium, boron, and silicon. The use of these elements, or of their compounds as silicon and boron bronzes, at present very limited on account of their high price, may thus be rendered more general.

PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE SOLAR SPECTRUM.

Professor H. A. Rowland, of the Johns Hopkins University, has lately published a very exact photographic map of the Fraunhofer lines. This work must prove of high value in the study of the Solar Spectrum, it reflects great credit upon the author, and shows once more how our country is taking the lead in all branches of science.

It is well-known that the Solar Spectrum, when obtained pure, is not continuous, but is interrupted by many dark lines perpendicular to its length. These lines are called Fraunhofer's lines, after the scientist who first attempted to map them. Such a spectrum—an absorption spectrum, as it is technically termed—gives us, after the discoveries made by Bunsen and Kirchhoff, an insight into the physical constitution of the sun. Thus, by means of the spectroscope, we have discovered in one of the solar envelopes, called the reversing layer, no less than fifteen metals known on our globe, besides hydrogen, and two other substances which as yet have not been found on the surface of the earth. The explanation of these dark lines in the solar spectrum is due to Kirchhoff. He was the first to state that gases and vapors have the power of absorbing those very rays which they themselves give out when in a state of incandescence. As an example, let us take the spectrum of sodium. The spectrum of this metal consists of a bright-yellow double line. If the light produced by incandescent lime be allowed to shine through the sodium vapor, the yellow line becomes black. From this fact we may draw important conclusions. Since the solar spectrum has dark lines where sodium, iron, etc., give bright ones, it is probable that around the body of the sun, which throws out the light, there exists a vaporous envelope which, like the sodium flame in the experiment described above, absorbs certain rays, namely, those which the envelope itself emits, and we are at the same time led to the conclusion that in this vapor there exist the metals sodium, iron, etc. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance to gain a better knowledge of the lines of the solar spectrum.

Many eminent scientists mapped these lines after Fraunhofer, but whenever refraction spectra are used the mapping is arbitrary, for in this case the position of the lines depends on the substance of the prisms. Amströng was the first to give a normal position according to the wavelength. Professor Rowland has perfected this method by means of diffraction spectra. As is well-known, physicists give the name of diffraction to that modification which light undergoes when it passes the sharp edge of a body, or when it traverses small apertures—a modification

such that the luminous rays become bent, and penetrate into the geometrical shadow, and at the same time interfere very near the shadow. When the rays are of ordinary white light, their interference produces beautiful spectra, much purer, though fainter, than those obtained by prisms, and the colors are divided exactly according to their wave-length. This phenomenon is best seen with gratings, which may be made by carefully ruling on glass or on speculum metal very fine lines parallel to each other. The best diffraction gratings ever made are those ruled by Professor Rowland, and contain 14,700 lines to the inch. The number of lines might be increased, but experiment has shown that the above number gives the best results.

Professor Rowland's photographic maps of the solar spectrum have been made with one of his concave gratings of $21\frac{1}{2}$ feet radius of curvature and 6 inches diameter. These maps are more exact and give greater detail than any other map now in existence, for the best gratings up to this time consisted only of about 6000 lines to the inch. The error in the wave-length at no part exceeds $\frac{1}{80000}$ of the whole.

We cannot dismiss this subject without referring briefly to the photographic study of Stellar Spectra. This study was undertaken by the late Professor Henry Draper: his plans included an extensive investigation, one object of which was to catalogue and classify the stars by their spectra. Mrs. Draper has made provision, at the observatory at Harvard College, for continuing these researches. The part of the sky to be surveyed is that extending from the north pole to the parallel of thirty degrees south declination. Each photograph will be exposed for about one hour, and will include a region ten degrees square. Experiments are now in progress with the fifteen-inch equatorial, with the object of representing the spectra of some typical stars upon a large scale. The spectra so far obtained are about six centimeters in length, and exhibit well defined detail. The present results encourage the expectation that the movement of stars in the line of sight may be better determined by the photographic method than by direct observations.

PASTEUR AND HYDROPHOBIA.

THE brilliant scientific investigations of M. Pasteur afford a striking example of the extremes that can be expected from public opinion. We have, on the one hand, scientists, wealthy men, and even the government, offering large sums to promote the international "Pasteur Institute" in Paris, while in other large cities, as in New York, similar ones are being planned. The remotest parts of Europe, as well as our own country, help to swell the crowd of patients at the Pasteur Laboratory, in the *rue d'Ulm*, and we cannot but notice the enthusiasm that his researches have everywhere aroused in the scientific world. On the other hand—not to speak of those who cast doubt on his success—the most violent attacks have been made on the great savant, and some

writers have gone so far as to accuse him of fraudulent pretensions. We must say, however, that many of these attacks, owing to the quarters from which they emanate, appear even at first sight suspicious. Most of Pasteur's enemies are enemies of mankind. They blame him because he does not join them in their anti-Christian theories.

With these facts before us, it is with pleasure we receive the announcement that the English and German Governments have appointed commissions of well-known scientific men whose names are a guarantee against all suspicion, such as Sir S. Paget, Sir H. Roscoe, Professor Koch and others, to examine into Pasteur's method, and that there are at present in Paris, for the same end, not a few doctors representing almost every nationality, prominent among whom are the delegates from the Roman Academy of Medicine.

The verification, however, of Pasteur's claims is not an easy task, for it is less than a year since his method was first applied and it is very difficult to ascertain the cases of real hydrophobia. M. Pasteur, in a communication to the French Academy of Science about the 12th of April, stated that among those treated by him only one had died out of 688 patients injured by dogs, and three out of 38 bitten by wolves, a fact showing, as he remarked, that wolves' virus, though of the same kind, is much more virulent than that of dogs. Certainly these few failures soon after the introduction of the method do not prove anything against it, especially as those who died were treated only some weeks after the accident had taken place. But, notwithstanding M. Pasteur's care in inquiring into the circumstances of the bites, who can assure us that all those persons, without his care, would have died? All vicious dogs are not "mad" and all "mad dogs" are not rabid. Besides, it often happens that the bites are not fatal, either because the wound is not deep enough, or because accidental causes prevent the virus from entering the organism. Such circumstances explain why among the many who were bitten by animals supposed to be rabid, the last census of our country records only 80 deaths from hydrophobia. That many such cases, however, are real, cannot be doubted and the evil seems to be spreading. It is true that in some places, as in Russia, owing to the enforcement of stringent laws, the statistics show a falling off, but in France, according to the official data of the *Ministère de l'Intérieur* in 1885, there were 568 real cases of hydrophobia against 301 of the previous year.

The following will give some idea of the method which M. Pasteur adopted after a long series of experiments:

The cure lasts for ten consecutive days. Each patient daily receives an inoculation or injection of the carefully prepared virus at a point on the waist, the operation producing no suffering, being much the same as vaccination. The quantity of the injected liquid is always the same, but its strength is increased on successive days, so that the liquid used on the last day, if it were injected into a healthy rabbit, would cause death from hydrophobia in eight or ten days. The successive inoculations seem to render the patient incapable of being affected by the next one, and all together, especially the last, free him entirely, in M. Pasteur's

opinion, from any danger of hydrophobia, whether the germ has been received into the body or not. Ordinarily, the patients do not experience anything from the effects of the injection, not even what is generally felt after vaccination. The difficult operation, and one to which M. Pasteur brings the utmost care, mainly belongs to the preparation of the virus, which is obtained from rabbits. This process, in its principal features, may thus be explained according to the *compte-rendu* of the French Academy. A rabbit is inoculated by trepanning the skull and placing beneath the *dura mater* a bit of the spinal cord from a rabid animal. Hydrophobia is always developed after a period of incubation of about fifteen days. If from the spinal cord of the first rabbit a second be inoculated in the same way, and from the second a third, and so on in a regular series, it is found that the period of incubation becomes shorter and shorter, till, after the virus has thus passed through forty or fifty rabbits, the duration of the incubation is reduced to seven days. Now, if portions of the spinal cords of rabbits that have died of the intense virus thus obtained be cut out with every precaution to prevent contamination, and kept in an artificially dry atmosphere, the virulence of the poison progressively disappears.

These fragments, preserved for a longer or shorter time, are used by M. Pasteur in preparing liquids of different strength. They are rubbed in "sterilized bouillon," namely, broth in which all animal germs have been previously destroyed by raising it to a high temperature. The solutions obtained in this way are used on different days; that taken on the last day is the strongest, being prepared from the cord of a rabbit which has died a few hours before.

At the last moment we learn that at the Johns Hopkins University Dr. Sternberg has begun to prepare some virus according to the method above described. The first two rabbits were inoculated with the virus taken from a gentleman who died in Brooklyn last May, from hydrophobia. The period of incubation was about 18 days, showing that the virus was very weak. We may, therefore, expect that before long some protective virus may be ready for use in this country.

Book Notices.

OUTLINES OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY. Designed as a Text-Book and for Private Reading. By *George Parke Fisher, D.D., LL.D.*, Professor in Yale College. Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Company, Publishers. New York and Chicago.

Professor Fisher's purpose in writing this book, as we learn from his preface, was to present the essential facts of history in due order and in conformity with the latest and most thorough researches, and to point out the connection of events and successive eras with one another, in order that thus the unity of history may be illustrated. The author declares his conviction that "the most interesting object in the study of history is that which most nearly touches the inner life of man, namely, the vicissitudes of institutions, social, political and religious." He adds, quite correctly, in the words of Dr. Arnold, that "a knowledge of the external is needed before we can arrive at a knowledge of that within. . . . And thus we want to know clearly the geographical boundaries of different countries, and their external revolutions. This leads us in the first instance to geography and history, even if our ultimate object lies beyond."

In accordance with these ideas, Professor Fisher has paid great attention in his work to the political geography of the world at different periods, and also to the physical features of its different countries. Upwards of thirty maps, in the preparation of which, evidently, no pains has been spared to secure perfect accuracy and distinctness, aid the reader in comprehending the changes wrought from time to time by military and political movements on different continents and countries.

In the composition of this volume Professor Fisher has had the advantage of great natural ability and acquired knowledge and prolonged study of various subjects, some of them immediately connected with history, others more remotely, yet still related to it. He has not only brought these advantages to the preparation of his work, but has evidently spared no additional labor, effort and research to make it as perfect from his own point of view as possible. The arrangement as regards the progress of events is admirable, the classification and the subdivision of subjects is clear and well carried out. It is a model of lucid, yet concise, statement of facts and events.

Yet just here Professor Fisher seems to have erred and contradicted his own theory of history on an all-important point. He has endeavored, and of course unsuccessfully endeavored, to unite comprehensiveness of view and multiplicity of topics with extreme condensation. He believes in the unity of history, and also that the *Divine Will* is a factor in history—a factor not destructive of, nor incompatible with, the freedom of the human will, but which is wholly permissive of it and consistent with it. Yet he endeavors to compress what, as regards its form and contents, is not a compendium of historical events, but a universal history of the human race, including its movements as respects war, politics, literature, art, industry, morals and religion, into the compass of a single 12mo. volume of 674 pages, including a copious index. The result is, of course, a failure as regards the interior significance of movements and events. Their true, real, moral and religious bearings and influences (and this after all constitutes their actual importance) are necessarily cursorily treated.

In this as in other respects Professor Fisher is inconsistent with, and has unconsciously contradicted, his own theory of history. He believes that the All Wise and Omnipotent Will of God as well as the free will of man is a constant factor in human history. Yet, as he declares, he has endeavored to write the outlines of a universal history of the human race from an "unsectarian" point of view; and this means—it can mean nothing else from a non-Catholic's pen—from a point of view which ignores *religion*, and consequently the Divine Will, as the ruler and guider of all human events to their ultimate results and consequences.

MISTAKES OF MODERN INFIDELS; OR EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY. COMPRISING A COMPLETE REFUTATION OF COLONEL INGERSOLL'S SO-CALLED MISTAKES OF MOSES, AND OF OBJECTIONS OF VOLTAIRE, PAINE AND OTHERS AGAINST CHRISTIANITY. By *Rev. George R. Northgraves*, Diocese of London, Ontario, Canada. Second Edition—Revised and Corrected. Detroit: Free Press Printing House, 1886.

This work is dedicated to the Right Rev. John Walsh, Bishop of London, Ontario, Canada. And in answer to the letter informing him of the author's intention to dedicate it to him, the Right Rev. Bishop, in anticipation of the publication of the work, declared his warm approval of the purpose and object of the book, and also testified in emphatic terms to the distinguished ability and ripe scholarship of the author, expressing his conviction that the book would be "a thorough and triumphant refutation of the misleading sophisms and specious . . . objections of the infidel school against the truth of the Christian religion."

Any one who has studied the evidences of Christianity and has been compelled to read or pay any attention to the objections of infidels, for the purpose of refuting them, needs only to glance down the pages of this volume to be convinced that the belief and hope expressed by Bishop Walsh with regard to its value and usefulness were well founded.

It is not an easy task, indeed it is a supremely difficult one, to write a book for general popular reading in answer to the objections and false assertions of modern infidels. The difficulty consists not in any originality or special subtlety or force in their objections and falsifications, nor yet in difficulty in stating facts and framing arguments that completely refute them. It consists in and grows out of an unfortunate characteristic of the age in which we live. Modern education and the habits and tendencies of our age have made the general public quick of apprehension, but superficial and illogical in its intellectual processes. It is satisfied with first impressions and thoughts, without taking the necessary time or possessing the necessary patience, and, in too many instances, is destitute of the necessary ability (owing to one-sided and imperfect training) to ascertain whether its first impressions are true or false. It rests on these impressions, and is unwilling to take the trouble to listen to or read thoughtful and thorough refutations of their erroneousness.

Hence the writer who sits down to answer infidel objections and refute infidel sophisms, has a hard task before him, if he intends that his book shall be read by the general public. For, to refute a sneer or a sarcasm, however contrary to fact, to truth and justice it may be, if not impossible, yet is the most difficult task a writer can undertake; and to drag into the light and thoroughly answer a false assertion, a lie that may be stated in ten lines, may require as many chapters.

Yet this difficult task the reverend author of the work before us has undertaken and performed. How admirably well he has done his work the warm approvals and commendations of it by nine distinguished Catholic Archbishops and Bishops that we know of, after having read his book,

and of a number of prominent Episcopalian Bishops and Clergymen and other prominent Presbyterian and Methodist Clergymen, strongly testify. The newspaper and periodical press also have noticed it in terms of high praise.

And the work deserves it. Brevity, conciseness and directness of statement and argument characterize it from beginning to end. Yet it is transparent in its lucidity of thought and language. It is a fit companion to Father Lambert's volume—"Notes on Ingersoll." Indeed, it is a valuable supplement to it. It answers and refutes, in a way that any intelligent person can apprehend, all the current objections that Infidels and Free-thinkers urge against the existence of God and his Attributes, against the existence, spirituality and immortality of the human soul, against the necessity, fact, credibility, and truth of Divine Revelation, the genuineness and authenticity, consistency and truth of Sacred Scriptures; especially of the Pentateuch and its statements respecting the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, and other facts therein recorded; as well as other numerous quibbles, misrepresentations and sophisms of modern infidels.

LIBRARY OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. WORKS OF THIS DOCTOR OF THE CHURCH, TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH. By the *Rev. Henry Benedict Mackey, O. S. B.*, under the Direction of the Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O. S. B., Bishop of Newport and Menevia. Vol. iii. *The Catholic Controversy*, now First Edited from the Autograph MSS. at Rome and at Annecy. With a hitherto unpublished section on the Authority of the Pope. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates, 1886.

This treatise is the message of St. Francis de Sales to the Calvinists. It was reluctantly written, because they would not, or could not without incurring the punishment of penal anti-Catholic laws, go to hear him preach. He neither published it nor named it. The Rev. translator has called it "*The Catholic Controversy*," partly because it corresponds with the title given it by the French editor, but chiefly because its scope is to state and justify the Catholic doctrine against Calvin and his fellow-heretics.

It is the Catholic position ever against them and all other heretics, and a defence of Catholicity as such. At the same time it is incidentally the defence of Christianity, because St. Francis de Sales' justification of Catholicity consists precisely in this, that it alone is Christianity; and his argument turns entirely on the fundamental question of the exclusive authority of the Catholic Church as the sole representative of Christianity and Christ.

In Part I. he shows at length that the Catholic Church alone has a mission; that she alone is sent to teach; and that thus the authority of all other teachers (outside of her communion and not subject to her) is void, and their teaching but the vain teaching of men.

He tests this teaching in Part II., by the Rule of Faith. He assumes as common ground that the Word of God is the Rule of Faith. He then shows that Reformers (so-called) have composed a false scripture, and that they have also erred in rejecting Sacred Tradition or the *unwritten* Word of God. He then shows that, while the Word of God is the Formal Rule of Faith, there is need of a *judge* who may explain, apply and authoritatively declare the meaning of the Word; and that judge is the Holy Catholic Church.

In Part III. he takes up the doctrines of the Church in detail. But of this Part there only remain three chapters, on the Sacraments and on Purgatory.

Of the intrinsic merits of the work we need scarcely speak. For the Saint's name and holy fame are sufficient guarantee of its clearness, forcibleness, directness, and simplicity of statement and argumentation, and of its value and usefulness in refuting heretical notions, which have descended to our own age, as well as of the edifying influence of this treatise in common with all that this distinguished Saint spoke or wrote, upon true and faithful children of the Church.

THE LIFE OF THE VENERABLE JOSEPH MARCHAND, APOSTOLIC MISSIONARY AND MARTYR. By *Abbé J. B. S. Jacquenet*, Director of the Besançon Seminary. Translated from the French, with a Preface by Lady Herbert. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.

It is through tears and blood that the holy missionaries of the Church preach the true faith to-day and rear the Cross as it was in the days of old. The declaration that "the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church," is as true now as it was in the times of the emperors of pagan Rome. The Lives, therefore, of holy missionaries who suffer persecution and torture and death for Christ's sake, are even more edifying than those of martyrs of long past ages.

The little work before us contains an account of one of these martyrs of our own century. And for this reason it is all the more valuable and will be all the more interesting and edifying to those who read it in a proper spirit and with proper intentions. For if the knowledge of what those who lived in times long past and endured all manner of tribulations for Christ's sake is useful to encourage us and strengthen us in resolutely continuing to fight the good fight of the Faith to the end, surely an acquaintance with what "Confessors" of the Faith and Martyrs are now enduring will be still more edifying. It will serve, too, to dispel a dangerous illusion. The idea is entertained by some that the age of persecution of Christianity, of the true Church and of its faithful children, is past. Yet neither in the un-Christian nations, whose wicked and impious customs skeptics and haters of Christianity frame apologies for, nor among "civilized" peoples, have hatred and persecution of the true Church of Christ and its followers and missionaries ceased.

Blessed Father Joseph Marchand was born at the commencement of the present century. After his ordination he was sent as a missionary to China. How faithfully and heroically, and with what self-denials and sufferings, he labored there, the little volume before us narrates. He received the glorious crown of martyrdom in 1835, after enduring tortures equal to, if not surpassing, any that were inflicted upon Christians in the days of Nero and Domitian.

And, though it may be aside from the immediate subject of our notice to refer to it, the same horrible tortures are inflicted upon Catholic missionaries in China, and the same persecution of the true Faith is carried on by the Chinese at this moment when we are writing, as existed a few years ago, and in previous centuries.

FLORA, THE ROMAN MARTYR. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company.

This work, in two good-sized 12mo. volumes, may never take a place among the classics of the language, but in this respect it may find itself in very good company. Written many years ago, by an English visitor to Rome, who dedicates it to the memory of the late Cardinal Antonelli, some may wonder why it is brought before the public only now. The author, who modestly disavows any literary pretensions, gives it to the world, we are told in the preface, "with a view of recording in their

first freshness the impressions of devotion gathered at many a Roman shrine." After a cursory perusal, we are easily led to believe that more than "several pages of it were hastily penned amidst the bustle of sight-seeing, when the connecting thread of the plot often became tangled, sometimes broken." We therefore readily grant the indulgence "asked for on account of certain anachronisms," as well as other things, and pardon the slight liberties taken with dates. The reader also may enjoy the lengthy descriptions, regarding them, like the author, with "the enthusiasm called up by the classical reminiscences of the Italian land," which "caused the writer to dwell too long on some favorite scene."

The story, which on the whole is edifying and healthy reading, belongs to the later age of Christian suffering under the pagan Roman Empire, opening in the summer of the year 235 of the Christian era. Most of the characters are fictitious, but some historical personages, like St. Lawrence and Origen, though perhaps not with exact reference to the incidents in their careers referred to, are introduced. A fanciful connection, too, is made with the infant Church in Britain. There are better and more artistically constructed books of the kind than "Flora," but there are few more harmless and more edifying to the young reader.

THE CHRISTIAN STATE OF LIFE, OR SERMONS ON THE PRINCIPAL DUTIES OF CHRISTIANS IN GENERAL, AND OF DIFFERENT STATES IN PARTICULAR. In seventy-six sermons. Adapted to all the Sundays and Holy Days in the Year. By the *Rev. Francis Hunolt*, Priest of the Society of Jesus and Preacher in the Cathedral of Treves. Translated from the original German edition of Cologne, 1740, by the Rev. J. Allen, D.D. In two volumes. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis. 1886.

Father Hunolt's sermons have been long and very favorably known in Europe. They are sound in doctrine, direct and practical in method. They display a thorough and accurate acquaintance with human nature, and powerfully appeal to every motive that can lead to virtue or to contrition and reformation of life. The style is plain, simple, concise. They are well adapted to aid clergymen, whose time is so engrossed by other duties that they cannot find leisure to write sermons. They also will furnish the laity with highly useful and edifying reading matter.

COMPENDIUM GRADUALIS ET MISSALIS ROMANI concinnatum ex editionibus typicis cura et auctoritate S. R. Cong. publicatis. Published by Fr. Pustet, New York and Cincinnati. 1886.

This latest publication by Chev. Pustet, though quite unpretentious when compared with his greater Liturgical works, is far from being the least important of the series; and it will soon, no doubt, be the most widely disseminated. We expect to see it in the hands of every student in our Colleges and Seminaries; and we strongly recommend it to the Rev. Clergy as a succinct, comprehensive and authoritative storehouse of information regarding the Morning Services of the Church. It contains all that is of practical interest to us scattered through the *Graduale*, the *Missale*, and the *Directorium Cleri*. A college or seminary whose students are furnished with this Compendium and the stereotyped editions of the *Vesperale* and *Holy Week Service*, is quite adequately equipped for the celebration of the Divine Offices in "holy becomingness." We respectfully direct the attention of the Rev. Clergy to the brief but pregnant extracts from the *Directorium Cleri* which the editor very wisely prefixes to his work. We venture to state that one hour's perusal of this little book would go far to eliminate a great many defects observable in the singing of Mass, defects altogether owing to complete inadvertence or a false impression that an extraordinary effort is required to supply the place of an early systematic training in Gregorian chant.

A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN SYMBOLS AND STORIES OF THE SAINTS, AS ILLUSTRATED IN ART. By *Clara Erskine Clement*. Edited by Katherine E. Conway. With Descriptive Illustrations. Boston: Ticknor and Company. 1886.

Elegance of binding and other mechanical features of a book must not be taken as an indication of the intrinsic value of the contents. So often is it otherwise, indeed, that suspicion is now awakened in most minds against the reading matter put between attractive looking covers, publishers having long made it a habit to deck out inferior literary ware in tinsel show so as to catch the eye of the frivolous lover of display. It is, then, with genuine pleasure that we welcome and recommend a work belonging to the class of exceptions to this rule, and certainly a very striking exception is the book whose title we give above. Paper, press-work, illustrations, binding, are all of a very superior order, but none too good for the character of the reading, of which, though printed from bold, clear type, there is an unusually large amount to the page.

The object the author has in view is to make the reader familiar with "symbolic forms which are known in a general way to represent the mysteries and facts of the Christian faith, but which fail to recall them to the uninitiated beholder in anything like a distinct and accurate manner." Her plan is admirably carried out in this collection of sacred legends and stories illustrated in art, which she prefaces with an essay on Symbolism, as pertaining to her subject. We are pleased also to observe that the book is furnished with a complete alphabetical Index. It is dedicated, by permission, to Archbishop Williams, of Boston.

THE ROMAN VESPERAL, ACCORDING TO THE VESPERALE ROMANUM, FOR THE ENTIRE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. For the Use of Catholic Choirs and School-children. By the *Rev. John B. L. Jung*, Priest of the Diocese of Cleveland. With the Approbation of the Right Rev. R. Gilmour, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

This work contains the Vesper Services of the Church for the whole ecclesiastical year. The reverend author says, in his preface, that it is intended "to meet the wants of school-children and others who wish to join in the congregational singing of Vespers." The antiphons are omitted, being left to the select choir.

THE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. With Notes by *John Oldcastle*. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. London: Burns & Oats.

This is a delightful book, made up chiefly from letters of Cardinal Manning and brief notes and statements by the author. It presents a clearer and more distinct view of the personal character of its illustrious subject than more elaborate accounts could give. Its value is enhanced, too, by five portraits taken at different periods of Manning's life, the date of the first one being 1812, and of the last 1886.

MURPHY SERIES OF ILLUSTRATED CATHOLIC READERS. Published with the Approbation of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.

This series commences with a Primer and Infant Reader, and then continues through six successive volumes. Good judgment has been exercised in selecting the reading matter. It is varied in subject and style, and is well adapted in each volume to the mental capacity of the scholars for whose use it is intended. The typographical execution is admirably well done. Solid white paper, clear type, firm and durable binding, and numerous illustrations, far superior to those found in most publications of this character.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—OCTOBER, 1886.—No. 44.

NATURE-WORSHIP—THE NEW RELIGION.

RELIGION, according to the derivation of the prince of pagan orators, who was guided only by the light of right reason, means an attentive pondering of divine things, a proper understanding of our relations to the Creator, a just appreciation of our dependence upon Him, and an humble recognition of His claims upon us. This appreciation and recognition, becoming habitual, beget in the soul a permanent disposition or inclination to render the Creator the worship due to Him, the homage of the intellect and the obedience of the will.

Taken in this sense, we must admit that religion is not a characteristic of the modern world. Modern thought is a revolt against the Creator, a challenge of His authority, a denial of His rights, an insubordination to His will. Yet are we, therefore, to infer, with Emerson and other professed leaders of modern society, that the human mind has become "self-dependent," "self-sustained," that it "needs no gift, no foreign force," and "resists all attempts to palm other rules and other measures on the spirit than its own"? Far from it. The religious sentiment is deep-seated in the human heart. Man's nature is essentially moral and religious; he can no more divest himself of all religious feeling than of his nature. Banish genuine religion with its hallowed rites and ceremonies, and there will appear in its stead a spurious religion with a superstitious cult and worship. Like Banquo's ghost,

it will not away. It has a message to deliver, and it will not leave you until you hear it. If you do not bend the knee to the Creator, you will bend it to the creature; if you do not adore the author of nature, you will adore nature itself.

Creatures, with the qualities flowing from them, fall under the general designation of nature and constitute the natural order. The Creator alone, with the attributes of His being, is above all nature and constitutes the supernatural order. To worship the Creator, as He should be worshipped, is true religion; to worship the creature is false religion, superstition, or idolatry.

Now, the Creator may manifest Himself to us by the light of right reason in a soul made to His own likeness; or He may manifest Himself to us by a special light, falling upon us like a reflection from His divine countenance. He may make known the manner in which He wishes to be worshipped by the natural revelation of creatures, pointing to the Creator from whose hands they sprang. Or he may make known the manner in which he wishes to be worshipped by the supernatural revelation of faith, poured down in floods from the "inaccessible light wherein he dwelleth."¹ Religion based upon the revelation of the creature is natural religion; religion based upon the revelation of faith is supernatural religion.

Having premised this much by way of definition, we may now distinguish, with Cardinal Manning, three periods of human reason in the history of mankind: a period in which the human reason wandered alone without revelation; a period in which the human reason, receiving the light of revelation, walked under the guidance of faith; a period in which the human reason, after forfeiting the light of revelation which it had, once more wanders alone without a guide, not as before worshipping the God of nature under the sensible form of an idol, but relegating the God of nature to the realms of the unknowable and worshipping nature itself as the only God.

To hasten the advent of this period is the avowed object of the self-constituted leaders of thought—of such men as Carlyle, Emerson, Matthew Arnold, Spencer, Harrison—who would fain persuade us that the old faith and the religion professed by our forefathers are out of date, and are soon to be superseded by "the creed of science" and "the religion of culture." They would resent it as a gross insult to be styled or thought irreligious. They irreligious! Nay, are they not praised by their admirers for their "deeply religious feeling"? Is not Mr. Emerson proclaimed by Professor Tyndall "a profoundly religious man"? Is he not compared by Oliver Wendell Holmes to the Messiah, and declared to be a man of such superior virtue and merit that his life ought to

¹ Four Great Evils, page 5.

be written as that of a saint? Are not George Eliot and others of the same stripe spoken of as "highly virtuous people"? Are they not all extolled as geniuses, and therefore, on the authority of Carlyle, to be considered as redeemers sent to work out the complete liberation of the race, as superior beings gifted with a divine intuition, and therefore not to be criticised, but to be heard with respectful awe?

They all set themselves up as the prophets of a new religion, as the apostles of a new Christianity, as the evangelists of a new gospel, commingling Judaism, Mahometanism, Buddhism and Christianity in one everlasting revelation, as the high priests of a new cult with symbols and rites expressive of religious thought in its present state of evolution. They often borrow the phraseology of the religion which they seek to destroy, and speak sanctimoniously of "revelations and creeds," of "mysteries and symbols," of a "trinity and an incarnation," of "sacraments and rituals." Should you happen unawares upon some detached excerpts from their writings, you would imagine that you were reading one of the mediæval Fathers, so interlarded are they with terms to which your ear has grown accustomed, so frequent are the allusions to practices to which your heart is attached.

Not that they have any respect for these practices; for, like Carlyle and Emerson, they are hostile to Christian ceremonies, which they condemn as hollow and insincere, as a lying imposture, as empty forms from which the substance has long since departed. Like Carlyle, they not unfrequently insult Christian piety by language such as he uses in his description of a London Sunday: "It is silent Sunday; the populace not yet admitted to the beer-shops, till the respectabilities conclude their rubric-mummies,—a much more audacious feat than beer." But, like Carlyle, who once felt himself attracted by the "dim light" in St. Paul's Cathedral and the "distant *Amen*" of the choristers, they know that sacred ceremonies speak a mystic language to the heart, and that the very names of truths learned in youth have a power to charm the ear. Under cover of these outward forms, they level their attacks not only at revealed religion, but at every religion which adores a Creator.

Their secret is betrayed by Matthew Arnold, one of the exponents of the "religion of culture." "Modern times," he writes, "find themselves with an immense amount of institutions, established facts, accredited dogmas, customs, rules, which have come to them from times not modern. In this system their life has to be carried forward; yet they have a sense that this system is not of their own creation, that it by no means corresponds exactly with the wants of their actual life; that for them it is customary, not

rational. The awakening of this sense is the awakening of the modern spirit. The modern spirit is now awake almost everywhere; the sense of a want of correspondence between the forms of modern Europe and its spirit . . . almost every one now perceives . . . To remove this want of correspondence is beginning to be the settled endeavor of most persons of good sense. Dissolvents of the old European system of dominant ideas and facts we must all be, all of us who have any power of working; what we have to study is that we may not be acrid dissolvents of them."¹ Now, as an able writer in the *Dublin Review* reminds us, the greatest of these "established institutions" and "accredited dogmas" of which Mr. Arnold wishes to be a dissolvent, is Christianity.

Carlyle is even more explicit, when he assures us that, if ever we "are to recover that pure and high spirit of devotion, the loss of which; however we may disguise it or pretend to overlook it, can be hidden from no observant mind, it must be by travelling on the same path, or at least in the same direction, in which the Germans have already begun to travel;" that is, the path travelled by Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schelling and others, the path afterwards travelled by Emerson until he discovered that "the true Christianity is a faith in the infinitude of man," that man is universal nature, and that nature is the god whom we ought to worship.

A professed Christian minister in a Christian pulpit tells us in a similar strain: "There is a perpetual evolution in religion. We may yet look forward to a grander and nobler form of worship, when the world will recognize God in everything, and the best Christians will be the most natural men and women."²

A recent critic in the *British Quarterly*, October, 1885, writes, in an article on Shelley, that this poet's hope in death is to be "made one with nature," that "he is one of the great brotherhood of prophets, or interpreters of nature," and in general that, "as this is an age of material science," so "it is an age of nature-poetry," and, of course, of nature-worship. Here is the clue to the whole system.

Modern science, known to be largely anti-religious, is looked upon by many timorous souls as the most dangerous adversary of religion. This, however, is a great mistake. Science addresses itself to the reason and can be combated by reason. It makes at least a show of argument, and can be met with real arguments. If a man does not despise logic as an intellectual jugglery, which only serves to confirm him in his skepticism; if he does not refuse to admit self-evident principles, to follow an argument, and to see a necessary conclusion correctly drawn from certain premises, it

¹ Essays on Criticism, page 158.

² Rev. R. L. Rexford, Universalist; sermon at the Church of Our Father, Detroit.

is no difficult task to disprove the groundless assertions and gratuitous assumptions, or to expose the lurking sophistries and fallacies of modern scientists.

The difficulty lies in the fact that man is not a pure intelligence guided by reason alone, but a compound being moved by sentiments, affections and passions. Reason, it is true, should preside as a queen over the inferior faculties; from her throne she should issue her mandates and be obeyed; she should never allow herself to be controlled, nor her vision to be obscured and her judgment to be warped by feeling. Unfortunately, we find that this is not always the case; we know by experience what Cardinal Newman calls the inadequacy of formal argument to convince even when it overpowers. To reach a man's reason, we must approach him through his prejudices, his inclinations, his tastes. To convince him of the true, we must gratify his sense of the beautiful, and appeal to what is human in him. This we can do most effectually by the medium of literature, of art, and of society. These are the ordinary channels of thought, and often exert a far greater influence than abstract reasoning or pure science, upon the religion and the morals of the masses. Now, these are at present enlisted in the service of the new religion of "culture" and of "nature-worship."

I. Literature has been well defined as beautiful human thought and right human feeling, expressed in choice human language. It is an image of a writer's thoughts and feelings, a photograph of his mind and heart. But it is more than this: it is a mirror of a nation's character and genius, of a nation's longings and aspirations, of a nation's virtues and vices, a reflection, as correct as its theology, of a nation's religion and morality.

Literature, it has been well said, is the embodiment of the pervading spirit of an age or country, or of what our German friends tersely call the *Zeitgeist*. "By literature," writes Cardinal Newman, "is meant the expression of thought in language; where by thought I mean the ideas, feelings, views, reasonings, and other operations of the human mind. Literature, then, is of a personal character; it consists in the enunciations and teachings of those who have a right to speak as representatives of their kind, and in whose words their brethren find an interpretation of their own sentiments, a record of their own experience, and a suggestion for their own judgments. A great author . . . is the one who has something to say and who knows how to say it. . . . I ascribe to him as his characteristic gift, in a large sense, the faculty of expression. . . . He expresses what all feel and all cannot say, and his sayings pass into proverbs among his people, and his

phrases become household words and idioms of their daily speech."¹

In this manner the noblest deeds of heroism and the purest acts of virtue are embalmed by literature in the hearts of the people and contribute in a mysterious way both to form the genius of the language and to mould the character of the nation. "What power has been more abiding," asks the writer in the *Dublin Review*, referred to above,² "than that of the masterpieces of genius, conceived in accordance with the moral law? They are with us to this day, not only those whose genius was the channel of inspiration and disclosed the counsels of the Most High; but Æschylus, and Homer, and Sophocles, and Pindar and Plato, the Grecian prophets; and Cicero, and Virgil, and Horace, a less glorious constellation, though likely to endure as long. These, too, had a gift from God and employed it, on the whole, as they were meant."

They are with us, let us add, the great classic authors of our own tongue, Shakespeare, and Milton, and Dryden, and Pope, and Addison, and Goldsmith, exhibiting, indeed, occasional signs of human frailty, yet, on the whole, so favorable to virtue and religion that, with a word of caution, they may be safely put into the hands of intelligent men and women.

They are with us, the early writers of our own land, the Bryants, and Longfellow, and Irvings, instinct with the moral life and health of a youthful nation, and offering at the shrine of virtue and religion the first-fruits of American genius. So free are most of them from any blame in point of religion—if we except slight prejudices against a venerable Church which they did not know—so free are they especially from any taint in point of morality, that, according to an English critic,³ they were found from the beginning in English homes, "on every young lady's book-shelf, where Byron was excluded and Tennyson half reluctantly admitted by maternal strictness."

How different the so-called modern school of "culture," whose spirit, according to the testimony of one of its leaders, is reactionary and anti-Christian, whose aim is to depict a world from which God is excluded and in which the moral laws have ceased to exist!⁴ In France this school started with Voltaire, the first of the "littérateurs" or "men of culture." Since his day popular French literature has had a blighting influence on religion and morality, bearing with it, wherever it was introduced, the germs of mental and moral disease, and infecting all the fountains of knowledge. There seems to

¹ Idea of a University.

² Dublin Review, July, 1885, page 50.

³ British Quarterly, October, 1885, article, "American Poets," etc.

⁴ Dublin Review, July, 1885, p. 48.

be in the very language a sort of contagion, that makes it particularly liable to breed pestilence among the people. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not yield, we trust, to any one in our admiration for the noble Catholic nation, with whose past exploits every page of history is luminous, nor in our appreciation of the beautiful tongue which was at one time, by universal consent, the language of cultivated European society. We know well that French was long the most common vehicle of Catholic thought and Catholic asceticism. We know well, as a learned English author has said, that "the giants of contemporary French literature, such as Châteaubriand, Gratra, Autran, Laprade, Montalembert, Dupanloup, and Lacordaire, have all been Catholics."¹ Nevertheless, with the same author, we must admit that "the principal writers in vogue in France, such as Sainte-Beuve, About, Sardou, and Alexandre Dumas, are all anti-Catholic in sentiment and feeling," and that "their works are deeply tinged with immorality." Yet these are the writers translated into English and most commonly read.

There is not one of the whole French school of "culture" whom, on the authority of reliable witnesses, a person can read without blushing and feeling disgraced. George Sand's writings, according to Lord Acton, are simply ignominious, Flaubert and Zola are utterly abominable, Theophile Gautier revolts from everything that in civilized countries has been called decent, the whole company of realistic romancers not only inculcate Atheism, but are unutterably vile and obscene.² Yet it is the writings of these men that constitute the popular literature of France, and create the popular sentiment.

Among the English speaking races the new school of "culture" is comparatively recent. It is not indigenous to the soil. Nevertheless, the sprig brought to England from across the Channel is already producing bitter fruit. Our own men of "culture," if less openly atheistical and less repulsively immoral than the French, are certainly more hypocritical and dogmatic. Unless you subscribe to their tenets, they tell you, like Carlyle and Emerson, that the highest sense, the "intuitive" principle "is not developed at all" in you, and stigmatize you as wholly "uncultured and unæsthetic."

Strange to say, with all our boast of intellectual freedom, there are those among us who submit meekly to this dogmatizing, and believe that no one can think who has not studied Matthew Arnold and Emerson; that no one can write who has not read George Eliot and Swinburne. Emerson tells the "cultured" men and

¹ Henry Bellingham, M.A., M.P., *Social Aspects of Catholicism and Protestantism*.

² Dublin Review, *supra*.

women who assemble season after season at Concord: "I do not know what arguments are in reference to any expression of thought. I delight in telling what I think; but if you ask me how I dare say so, I am the most helpless of mortal men." He tells them: "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen, and philosophers, and divines. With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do. . . . Speak what you think now in hard words, and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict everything you said to-day."¹ At least this is his teaching as formulated in his writings.

And those "cultured" men and women admire his teaching and love to call him the "master." They refuse to sit with the fishermen of Galilee at the feet of the Redeemer; they discard the revelation of the Bible as not sufficiently advanced; they ridicule the inspiration of the Jewish prophets as not conformable to modern thought. Yet they sit at the feet of Ralph Waldo Emerson; they accept his dreams and conceits as the gospel of enlightenment; they reverence his dicta as oracles of wisdom. Religion of some kind men will have; revelation of some kind they will believe; inspiration of some kind they will admit—if not the inspiration of heaven, at least the inspiration of so-called genius too often erratic, unbalanced, and unsound.

Emerson tells those "cultured" men and women: "The true Christianity is a faith in the infinitude of man,"—man's mind "is the only almighty giver in part and in infancy,"—"his thought is the universe." He tells those "cultured" men and women that he cannot distinguish the clouds from himself:

"The clouds are rich and dark, the air serene,
So like the soul of me, what if 'twere me?"

And those "cultured" men and women believe him and think that they, too, are the clouds, the universe, the almighty giver, endowed with infinitude, the nature-God, whom they must worship. Was there ever such an exhibition of insanity outside of a madhouse? The writer of this paper is well acquainted with an unfortunate inmate of a lunatic asylum—perhaps he ought rather be called fortunate, because he is happy in his delusion—who fancies that he is God the Creator, and spends his days in making the universe over again. He experiences a difficulty, however, with regard to one animal. He cannot make up his mind whether he should make it a biped or a quadruped. As soon as he has resolved this difficulty to his own satisfaction, the face of the world will be renewed. The realization of this difficulty seems to indicate that there is at least one sound spot in his mind. Mr. Emerson experienced no such diffi-

¹ Letter to Mr. Ware.

culty; his "mind was the only almighty giver"; his "thought was the universe"; and he was continually creating it for himself and his adorers. And this is called philosophy!

Emerson tells those "cultured" men and women: "If a man claims to know and speak to you of God, and carries you back to the phraseology of some old and mouldered nation in another country, in another world, believe him not." "The faith that stands on authority is no faith." "The height, the deity of man is to be self-sustained, to need no gift, no foreign force." "Free should the scholar be—free and brave." "No laws can be sacred to me but that of my nature" (*i.e.*, of the nature-god, of whom I am a part, an incarnation). "The highest virtue is always against the law." "Good and bad are but names very readily transferable to that or this; the only right is what is after my constitution; the only wrong, what is against it . . . if I am the devil's child, I will live then from the devil." "In self-trust all the virtues are comprehended." (Humility used to be looked upon as the foundation of "all the virtues.") "This one fact the world hates: that the soul *becomes*; for that forever degrades the past, turns all riches to poverty, all reputation to shame, confounds the saint with the rogue, shoves Jesus and Judas equally aside." And this is the religion, this the morality practised by the school of "culture"!

Such are the principles propounded by the "master," disguised and tricked out by the disciples in all the ornaments of a polished style, and devoured by the young and the old as polite literature. Ralph Waldo Emerson has been quoted even by prelates and divines without a word of disapproval; George Eliot has been spoken of as "the most effective preacher of morality England has seen these fifty years"; and her writings have been known to grace the shelves of a girls' library in a convent school, before their tendency was discovered.

Yet the aim of the whole school of "culture" is the same, from Matthew Arnold with his austere Atheism, down to Swinburne with his polished sensualism. One and all, they insinuate that there can be no god except nature, and that nature should be the object of supreme worship. These are the most formidable adversaries of religion and morality—far more dangerous than the infidel philosopher and scientist. Ingersoll may rave against God; Huxley may degrade man to the level of the brute. There is no charm in their blasphemies for the virtuous soul, no argument in their madness for the sound mind; and pernicious as their doctrines are, they are not apt to meet with much favor, unless they are presented under the bewitching form of literature.

II. What has been said of literature is equally true of art; because, like literature, it appeals to the sentiments, affections and

passions of the human heart. It speaks a language of its own, silent, indeed, and mysterious, but as captivating as words and often far more effective.

It is not the writer's purpose to descant upon the nature of art, upon the ideal that it must copy, or even upon the religious feeling that must underlie all true art. He does not presume to improve upon the learned lectures to which many of his readers have listened, and the able articles which they have read in the latest numbers of some of our best magazines. But taking for granted that there is no art without some ideal, without some archetype and mental model or pattern, and that religion has always furnished the highest ideals, prompted the grandest works of art, and inspired the noblest efforts of genius, he will endeavor to show that the irreligious spirit of the age has worked out its own ideals and impressed its features upon the productions of modern art.

Paganism was unable to raise art, as expressive of religious sentiment, to its highest perfection. For, if the ideal is imperfect and defective, the form under which that ideal is expressed must of necessity be imperfect and defective. Now, this ideal the Pagan artist always drew from some one of the many divinities whom he looked upon as endowed with the privilege of immortality, but in all else little better than man, subject to the same passions and animal instincts as the lowest of the human species. Nevertheless, as long as Pagan Greece had some external reverence for its gods, art flourished under the protection of religion and in return helped to keep up the semblance of religion. Olympus was not so far from the thoughts of many an honest Pagan as heaven is from the thoughts of some half-hearted, nominal Christians. God was an abiding reality for him, and false as was his conception of the divine nature, it had an effect on his daily life.

Christian art was from its nature a confession of faith. Its only study was how it might give glimpses of the spiritual world. Its very first efforts evinced the supernaturalizing influence of Christianity. Paganism had cast the gods from Olympus to surround them with the gross clog of matter; Christianity raised men towards heaven, to invest them with the ethereal subtilty of a spirit. "Those who would realize what it is to see a spirit," remarks Mrs. Jameson, "must gaze upon Fra Angelico's risen Saviour."

A high authority has expressed the same idea by saying that classicalism, or the old Greek school, believed in its gross mythology, and its works were as material as its creed; that mediævalism, or the Christian school, believed in its symbolical Christianity, and its creations were as spiritual as its faith; but that modernism, or the school of the Pagan Renaissance, believes in neither, and

its art, like its religion, is a mere negation. We need only add that, in our day, modernism in art has itself evolved into a new religion. The school of "culture" believes in nature-worship, and its productions are as sensual as nature after the fall.

Modern genius makes the mere animal representation of the "human form divine";¹ it "deifies physical loveliness"; it delights in what Matthew Arnold himself has described as "the sensuous tumult of the Renaissance"; it aims at taking the heart captive by awakening debased and prurient sentiment, and asks us to admire its works under pain of being thought "uncultured."

Now, as a well known and much esteemed non-Catholic professor wrote last fall, when the Committee of the Exposition in St. Louis had excluded certain pictures from the Gallery of Fine Art: "There should be no difference of opinion as to the impropriety of publicly displaying pictures of scenes, actions, and sentiments from which all right-minded people strive to shield their sons and daughters. . . . The canons of high art are not always to be imported from Paris. During the past summer it has been my privilege to inspect the exhibitions of living artists, not only at Paris, but in Florence, Munich, Dresden, and London, and nowhere out of Paris did I see any particularly objectionable pictures. Those in Dresden, where there were many of a high order of merit, were strikingly free from blemishes of the character we are considering."

In Paris the "cultured" artist, as well as the "littérateur," no longer hides his real motive. What William Samuel Lilly wrote of Zola, the novelist, is equally true of the cultured artist. He prides himself on knowing how to satisfy the needs of the "*bête humaine*." "Of what? does the astonished reader ask. We answer soberly, of the *bête humaine*. In Zola's view man is a beast; all men are essentially ignoble and unclean, though education may varnish them over. . . . The *New Democracy* are a collection of *bêtes humaines*, who know that they are human beasts and do not pretend to be anything else, who are well aware that the old religious conceptions which regard them as something else, are cunningly devised fables." Such is the naturalistic evolution. "The visible, when it rests not on the invisible (whether in art or in literature), becomes the bestial. . . . It leaves of him (man) nothing but the *bête humaine*, more subtle than any beast of the field, but cursed above all the beasts of the field."²

The authorities we have quoted are, we think, unexceptionable. They are intelligent, fairminded men, who know whereof they speak and are not likely to be carried away by prejudice. But as there is, perhaps, in many of us a latent disposition to identify what

¹ "Religious Feeling in Art," *Month*, for January, 1886.

² London Tablet, August 22d, 1885.

is French with what is Catholic, and to regard a disparagement of French art almost as a disparagement of Catholic morality, it will not be amiss to add the authority of the distinguished French Abbé, Joseph Roux, whose "*Pensées*," recently published in book-form, have elicited the praise even of the bitterest enemies of religion, in France and elsewhere, for their depth and their just appreciation of the subjects which he treats. Contrasting ancient Greek and modern French art, he writes: "Ancient art clothed the human body with chastity and majesty; modern art unclothes even the nude. It is an unchaste, sometimes an impudent art. Athens poured a soul over the body; Paris spreads a body over the soul. The Greek statue blushed; the French statue calls forth blushes."

The school of "culture" among us may be somewhat less shameless than in France, but its art-principles are the same. "Already," as one of our daily newspapers remarked in a well-reasoned article, last fall, "we see the effects of this bastard art in shop-windows, where paintings, engravings and photographs are occasionally displayed which, if offered for sale in small copies upon the street, might make the vender liable to arrest."¹

We may add: We see the effects in the convenient morality of some of our young art-students, who would fain have us believe that their senses are so sublimated by artistic "culture" as to receive only æsthetic impressions from beholding, studying and copying pictures or objects, "from which all right-minded people strive to shield their sons and daughters." We see the effects in the devotees of "culture," who think themselves obliged to admire everything that comes from Paris, and who take it upon themselves to interpret for us the customs and usages of polite society, to educate the public taste, and, by their example, to give a tone to the community.

III. Extravagant as these pretensions are, polite society seems disposed to regard them with some consideration. It is very yielding and susceptible to outside influences. It readily takes up new theories, and carries them out for the sake of the novelty. It dwells in a fairy-land of speculation, poetry and æstheticism, and often seems somewhat of a stranger amid the bustle and business of real life. It charms the world of imagination down to this world of action, and clothes the ideals of human thought with the tangible forms of living men and women. It acts out what it admires in literature and art. Herein lies the secret of its power over the human heart. "The heart is commonly reached," writes Cardinal Newman, "not through the reason, but through the imagination, by means of direct impressions. . . . Persons influence us, voices melt us, looks subdue us, deeds inflame us."

¹ St. Louis Republican.

Man is, by nature, a social being; in the company of those who are on the same intellectual and social level with him, he finds his highest and purest natural pleasures. The charm of good manners, the graces of conversation, the magnetism of personal refinement exercise an indescribable fascination over us, and, if we may be permitted to apply the words of the sacred book, "draw us with the cords of Adam." When the tastes and habits of good society are correct and sound, the national life is healthy and vigorous; when they are false and vitiated, the nation seems doomed to inevitable decay.

It is, therefore, of the highest importance to watch over the purity of social life, and not to subscribe, without much caution, to the canons or rules that govern it. Frequently these are not of our own making, any more than the fashions. We are not consulted about them; they are imported from abroad. We are simply told to conform ourselves to them, if we wish to pass for ladies or gentlemen. And, so long as they do no violence to conscience, it may be a mark of good breeding to submit, as gracefully as we can, to their requirements, however arbitrary and unnatural they appear to us.

But, when we are called upon to believe, as Carlyle puts it, that "society is founded on cloth," to subscribe to the "divine idea of cloth," or, in the strong language of Hazlitt, to make dress almost a sacrament—"an outward sign of the inward harmony of the soul"—to hold that "manners are morals," and that "culture is religion," it behooves us, in the interest of our common manhood and womanhood, to enter a vigorous protest against such insane demands.

True, it is not pleasant to be taunted with a want of "culture." But, when "culture" means to recognize what Zola calls the "needs of the *bête humaine*," however varnished over, it is the highest refinement to escape from the contagion. Thus, Paula and Eustochion, under the guidance of Jerome, escaped from the contagion of cultured pagan society, when to mingle in its pleasures meant to offer incense upon the altar of voluptuousness. There is a higher law than that of "cultured" society—the law of right reason and of God. Whatever is not conformable to that law, how fashionable soever it may chance to be, is abominably low and coarse and vulgar.

We may apply to society the remark on art by the learned professor whom we have already quoted: "The canons of good breeding are not always to be imported from Paris." If ever there was a society which made a boast of culture and refinement, it was French society under Louis XIV. and Louis XV. To reproduce in miniature the brilliant circles that gathered at Versailles, to copy

their courtly manners, and even, we are told, to revive the names and the patterns of the costumes worn by them, is the highest ambition of the votaries of modern "culture." For the honor of our country, let us suppose that our "cultured" friends are as ignorant of the historic associations of the persons and characters of those days, as they are proud of their styles of dress and of their "culture." Polished that society undoubtedly was, which flocked to the gorgeous *fêtes* and *carousels* held under the auspices of the *grand monarque*—a very "galaxy of glory and beauty, revolving around one central figure as satellites around their sun."

But, to that bright picture there was a dark side which no art can illuminate. Those "cultured" ladies and gentlemen, though Christians in name, practised the most revolting form of nature-worship. Versailles was the shrine to which the *élite* of French society—excepting only those whom the authority of men like Fénelon preserved from the shameful idolatry—repaired to adore, and to be adored in turn. There was more ceremony there, more abject homage, than in temple of the living God. Men of the first rank deemed it a privilege to wait upon the *grand monarque*, and hand him his royal stockings; ladies made it a matter of etiquette to sacrifice their virtue to the royal pleasure. Nor were they all as penitent as the pale and pensive Louise de la Vallière—the real goddess of the gorgeous temple of nature-worship—of whom we are told that, by "her modesty and humility, in the midst of her erring triumphs (she) drew from all hearts the pardon she had never wrung from her own uncompromising conscience."¹

Louis XIV. died with ceremony; and the etiquette of "culture" and sin went on increasing, until it culminated, under his ignoble successor, in the apotheosis of the vilest passions. The pagan saturnalia were not more lascivious than the elegant receptions of the French Court. Louis XV. fell a victim to his love of "culture," and died abandoned by all save his two daughters, who had the courage to breathe the poisoned atmosphere of the royal bed-chamber; and the unutterable mass of corruption, once called a king, was hustled into a coffin, smuggled away by a few menials in the dead of night, and consigned, without ceremony or courtiers, to the ready-made grave in St. Denis. With him the *présteige*, attached to the very name of royalty in France, was buried, it would seem, to be resuscitated no more.

Would that Louis XVI. had been allowed to redeem, by his simple habits, the sinful extravagances of his predecessors, and Marie Antoinette to continue playing at shepherdess, and making the groves of Arcadia ring with her innocent peals of laughter! It was too late. The fatal handwriting was upon the wall at

¹ Catholic World, October, 1872, "Versailles."

Versailles, as it was upon the wall of Balthasar's banquet-hall; nor was there need of a Daniel to decipher its mysterious meaning. The doom was sealed; and the sentence has been executed down to our day with unrelenting rigor. The end is not yet. When shall it come? Who will dare predict? This much is evident to the impartial student of history, that excessive material civilization and luxury are responsible for the crimes and miseries which have poured, like avenging floods, over beautiful France. There is more than a chronological relation between the "culture" of Louis XIV., the blasphemies and ribaldry of Voltaire,—who was among the principal promoters of the sinful splendors of Versailles,—the ravages and indecencies of the first Revolution, the murders and sacrileges of the Commune, and the war now systematically waged against the Almighty by the infidel Republic of Grévy.

Infidelity in France is not something negative, as it often seems to be among us. It amounts to a diabolical hatred of God and of His perfections. "*Écrasez l'infâme*" was its watchword of old; "*Dieu, c'est l'ennemi*" is its watchword now. Whence the virulence which distinguishes this mental epidemic in France, and makes it so much more fatal than in other lands? To the writer it has sometimes occurred, that the answer to this question might be found in the very excellence of the gifts of nature and of grace bestowed upon that country, and wantonly abused by the representative and most favored members of society. Do not spiritual writers of the highest authority favor this explanation when they tell us, in the words of the old axiom of the schools, "*Corruptio optimi pessima?*" Was not Lucifer an archangel before his fall? No wonder, then, that France should be a land of violent contrasts, of strong lights and shades, of heroic virtues and revolting crimes.

But, if we ask further, wherein lies the abuse of the gifts bestowed in so eminent a degree upon France, we shall, probably, have to look for the answer in the worship of nature instead of nature's God. Infidelity among the French is not due, as much as it is among us and our Teutonic cousins, to ignorance, heresy or false philosophy. Of the average French infidel, even more than of the American, the English, or the German, it is true that he "hath said in his heart, there is no God." He is far too clear-headed to say so in his intellect. But he is very prone to say so in his heart. Unless his heart is wholly fixed upon God, it goes astray after creatures, and worships the sensible and the sensuous instead of the spiritual. Hence, to borrow a word of Matthew Arnold's,—whose authority on this subject is of some weight,—the distinguishing feature of French worldliness and false culture is "lubricity." Excepting, of course, devout French Catholics, who are often paragons of angelic purity, Venus nowhere finds more ardent adorers than among the high society of France. What the Catholic

Church and reason agree in condemning as the grossest form of immorality, is so fashionable in the highest circles of France, that, according to the testimony of one who knows, it has come to be called, by a blasphemous perversion of terms, the practice of chastity. It is only necessary to consult the comparative statistics of France and the neighboring countries, given in a recent number of the *Dublin Review*, to see, at a glance, how Heaven is punishing this infraction of its laws in the diminution of her population. Here is the explanation of the rabidness of French infidelity. As the demoniac, possessed by the demon of impurity, when he was brought face to face with Christ, so, too, French infidelity, when it is brought face to face with God, foams and froths, and goes into spasms and convulsions. "God is a spirit, and those who adore Him must adore Him in spirit."

Viewing the present distracted condition of a noble, generous and once happy people, and taught by the logic of events, one is tempted to ask—despite the many old masterpieces of literature, despite the grand monuments of ancient art, despite the high order of Christian culture found, at the present day, among the virtuous elements of French Catholic society—whether it would not be for the good of true civilization and humanity, if French literature, French art and French "culture" were swept promiscuously from the face of God's earth.

There are mothers, and fathers, too,—good, simple souls,—who wonder how it happens that their sons, though educated in Christian schools, have learned to scoff at religion; that their daughters, though nursed like tender plants, have forgotten the modesty which is supposed to distinguish Christian maidenhood. Somehow, when we hear their expressions of surprise, there come back to us, with all the force of first impressions, the words of an infidel French officer, which shocked our ears, some twelve years ago. This officer had a son, just budding into manhood, with the blush of innocence upon his cheek, with the fervor of devotion in his heart. Friends complimented the father upon the brilliant talents of his son, but hinted, at the same time, that the youth would not be likely to follow his father's example, or abandon the strict notions of religion and morality with which he had been imbued at a model Catholic boarding-school. "Oh," replied the officer, in language that shows how coarse the admirers of "culture" can be, "I will knock all that prudery and superstition out of him in two months." And how, think you, kind reader? By introducing him to the "cultured" society of Paris. We have strong reasons to fear that the father's efforts were successful.

Many Catholic children are deliberately exposed, by worldly-minded parents, to similar influences. Yet these parents complain,

of the inefficiency of Catholic education to restrain the excesses of passion ; as if Catholic education meant a perpetual renewal of the miracle wrought upon the youths in the Babylonian furnace, for the special benefit of those who presumptuously throw themselves into the flames. Many children are daily taking lessons in the new school of " culture," and burning incense at the shrine of nature-worship. Yet their parents are astonished that the children learn these lessons. The old family Bible, that formerly lay upon the centre-table, in the sitting-room or parlor, has been replaced by one of the many editions of the new Gospel, by Zola and other prophets of " culture "; the rudely-carved crucifix, that stood upon the mantle, by an artistic statue of a pagan Venus or Cupid ; the sacred prints, that hung upon the wall, by a naturalistic painting of some saint or demi-god of the religion of nature-worship. Children ask what all those objects mean, from which the pure-minded man and woman of maturer years instinctively turn away their eyes ; they learn the " needs of the *bête humaine*," and feel the revolt of passions whose very names the young should not know nor the aged pronounce ; they practise nature-worship far more assiduously than Christianity, and understand infinitely more of the ritual of fashion than of the august ceremonial of their church.

As a consequence, religion comes to be regarded by them as a " respectable adjunct to social usages," consisting mainly in gentlemanly instincts, and to be practised, if practised at all, with a due regard to social "*convenance*." Faith is extinguished, reason clouded, conscience hardened, and all morality summed up in Diderot's maxim, " to follow in everything the cravings of one's heart." In other words, unbridled passions sway the soul, and give for moral resultant what Allies designates as heathenism : " Man, as an animal, will give his body every indulgence in food and other animal pleasures which he can procure ; and, as an animal endued with mind, he will seek no less to satisfy the desires of his mind, such as consist in the cultivation of the affections, in acquiring knowledge, distinction among his fellow men, power over them, whereby he may make them the instruments of his pleasures."

According to all sound philosophy, pagan as well as Christian, it is irrational, and, therefore, criminal, to pursue pleasure for the sake of pleasure ; because the sensible good—the *bonum delectabile*—is designed by the Creator merely as a condiment to give zest to the rational good—the *bonum honestum* ; and, consequently, a life devoted to pleasure, even if it be not sinful pleasure, deliberately frustrates the purposes of the Creator. But the worshippers of nature make as little account of philosophy and right reason as they do of faith and religion. So, far from being ashamed of their

worthless existence, they pride themselves upon it, and, perhaps, they tell you, as they have told the writer, that they wish for a life of enjoyment, short but intense. They remind you forcibly of the threat uttered by the Almighty: "My spirit shall not remain in man forever, because he is flesh." Even before the boy or girl has developed into manhood or womanhood, there is often little left but the form, the hollow shell of humanity. The eyes are without lustre, the cheeks without color, the features without expression, the words without meaning, and, we are almost tempted to say, the body without a rational soul. There is before you a wreck, an intellectual *roué*, a moral *blasé*, "lapped," as a recent writer on Christian art has expressed it, "in asphodel and moly, and making of his being an Æolian harp for the breath of sensuousness to play upon."¹

Infiltrating from the higher strata of society to the lower, the poison gradually infects every condition, and transforms the hardest races into base Sybarites, whose religion is the idolatry of the senses, whose object in life is the pursuit of animal pleasures.

This process of national deterioration is scarcely perceptible, while it is going on. It is least feared by those who are most affected by it. It is like the transition from day to night; the shadows fall upon us so stealthily, and the eye accommodates itself to the diminished light so gradually, that we are involved in darkness before we are fully aware of it. It is like the decay going on within some luscious fruit; the exterior retains its form and color, long after the canker-worm has eaten out the very heart. It is like the poisonous odors of some tropical flowers; while we are enjoying the scented essences mingled with the air we breathe, we fall into a fatal slumber, perhaps to awake no more.

Observant men of every school of thought deplore the rapid spread of luxury, and give themselves up to the gloomiest forebodings. There are Darwinians, positive in maintaining the gradual evolution of the human race from protoplasm, but equally positive in predicting its gradual deterioration until by its sensual indulgence it has worn itself out, and ends in the total extinction of the species. There are Humanitarians, who look forward with satisfaction to another deluge of barbarism that shall sweep away the effete civilization of modern Europe. There are Republicans, who rest all their hopes upon the social revolutions constantly occurring in such a state of society as ours. The vigorous elements of society, they tell us, perpetually working themselves up from below, will cast off the wasted matter from its surface, even as the agitated billows of the sea cast off the froth and scum. The hardy

¹ London Month., January, 1886, page 59.

sons of toil will displace the pampered children of luxury, and “the fittest will survive.”

Whatever may be the merit of these peculiar theories, advanced by modern philosophers, they go to show, at least, this much: that the growth of luxury is something alarming to contemplate. If, now, we turn even to the most temperate writers of a very different school from those we have quoted, we shall be told that the signs of deterioration are on every side of us, even where we should least of all expect to find them. Not long ago, they remind us, there were women so prudish that they covered the legs of their pianos with pantalets, and feigned to swoon away if any one called them legs in their hearing. At present, these same women, or their daughters, imagine that they are not refined or attractive, unless they appear in society in such a condition that a man, who keeps a becoming guard over his eyes, dare not look at them; and that their conversation is not “cultured” or fascinating, unless it is racy with what they euphemistically style the “natural,” but what the highest authority condemns in the strongest terms as “flesh and blood—*caro et sanguis*.” They verify, literally, the words of the inspired author: they call good evil, and evil good. Their moral sense is utterly depraved. Physical cleanliness is confounded with moral purity; squalid virtue is decried as immoral, gilded luxury is extolled as highly moral. There are lower depths, into which the votaries of “culture” have fallen; but I care not to sound them to the bottom. Would that those who are gayly dancing upon the brink of the precipice, were to listen to a word of timely warning and retrace their steps! But, perhaps, this is more than we have a right to expect from them; for “the bewitching of vanity obscureth good things, and the wandering of concupiscence overturneth the innocent mind.”

What aggravates the difficulty and the danger in our age is the want of definite religious principles. Without religious principles it is impossible to fix the bounds of morality, to determine when the exaggeration of seeming modesty degenerates into prudery, or the want of genuine virtue becomes lasciviousness. Without religious principles, the customs and usages of cultured society will infallibly end, as they are ending among us, in the grossest sensualism and nature-worship. The only true remedy is to be sought in the salutary restraints imposed by Christianity. As it rescued men from the barbarism of paganism, so it can rescue them from the barbarism of culture. As it reclaims individuals, so it can reclaim society. The task, we admit, is a difficult one. But Christianity has reserved forces that need only be called forth. What is wanted is united, concerted action on our part. The evils which we deplore are the direct effects, not of Atheism in the garb of science

or of rationalism in the disguise of philosophy, but of false culture in the form of literature, of art, and of society.

Men are not tempted to commit mental or moral suicide by an appeal to their reason, but by an appeal to their feelings. They do not covet evil, unless it be presented under the appearance of good. Cleopatra wished to die by the fangs of a viper concealed in a basket of roses; Heliogabalus by a sword of gold; the sentimental young maiden, of whom we read, by a goblet of poison wreathed in her intended wedding-crown. And to borrow an example from a higher authority than profane history, Eve was not tempted to eat the forbidden fruit until she had looked and seen that it was beautiful to behold. It is the fickle heart, the vagrant imagination, the truant senses, which hurry men and nations to destruction.

If, then, we desire to arrest their headlong course, we must not be satisfied with refuting the false principles of a rationalistic philosophy or the assumptions of atheistic science; we must encourage Catholic literature, cultivate Catholic art, and build up a Catholic society.

We must endeavor to make Catholic society what it was made in days past by Thomas More, the martyred premier of England, by Francis Borgia, the sainted duke of Gandia, and what it is made at the present day by those who have remained true to the traditions of the Catholic home: a school of virtue, from which we may return to the privacy of domestic life, not only more refined gentlemen and ladies, but what is infinitely more important, better men and women. This, it seems to us, is the special mission in life of educated Catholics of leisure, who realize that nothing is truly cultured, truly refined, truly æsthetic, truly beautiful, except in so far as it mirrors and reflects the infinite loveliness of God, the prototype, not only of what is true in science, but of what is beautiful in literature, in art, and in society.

THE MONKS AND CIVILIZATION.

The Monks of the West. Montalembert.

Legends of the Monastic Orders. Mrs. Jameson.

Lives of the Saints. Butler.

CIVILIZATION is the condition of man who, fallen from "original justice" and its accompanying dominion over the world, has revived in himself more or less the image and likeness of God in which Adam was created, and reasserted in a greater or less degree that control of the universe, its occupants and forces, which had been granted him from the beginning. This state implies mastery of his passions, development of those faculties which have for their object the true, the good, and the beautiful, and advance in the knowledge and direction of the elements of nature, as well as in the government of the family, the state, and the supernatural society established by the Son of God. Progress, properly so-called, must be in this direction. Hereby lie its final or motive principles.

It is not by principles that the world is moved, but rather by men who are the incarnation of those principles. All great movements are begun by extraordinary individuals, every reform needs a man for its leader, every institution, even Divine Religion itself, must have a MAN for its corner stone. "The founders of the various religious communities," says Mrs. Jameson, "were all remarkable men, and some of them were more, they were wonderful men; men of genius, of deep insight into human nature, of determined will, of large sympathies, of high aspirations, poets, who did not write poems, but acted them." Although at first the communities were exclusively of laymen, very soon many of them were elevated to the priesthood by the authorities of the Church who recognized their fitness, and innumerable bishops out of the most holy and illustrious in history sadly abandoned their alls to wield the pastoral staff. At least forty of the Supreme Pontiffs were of the Order of St. Benedict, beginning with Gregory the Great, Apostle of England. The monkish missionaries carried the light of the Gospel into the wilds of Britain, Gaul, Saxony, Belgium, where heathenism still solemnized impure and inhuman rites, and with the Gospel carried peace and civilization, and became the refuge of the people, of the serfs, the slaves, the poor, the oppressed,

against the feudal tyrants and military despoilers of those barbarous times. "They were," says Kemble in his "Anglo Saxons," "permanent mediators between the rich and the poor, between the strong and the weak, and it must be said to their eternal honor that they understood and fulfilled in a marvellous way the duties of this noble mission."

Our own country's story gives examples of the same influence in latter days. On the bronze doors of our Capitol at Washington the figure of the monk reminds us of the part played by him in the first great enterprise of our country's discovery, and the name of the Dominican Las Casas is immortalized in the history of Columbus as that of the "friend of the weak." He exerted himself to the utmost to protect the Indians against their conquerors, made four voyages back to Spain to influence legislation in their favor, and was appointed Protector General of the Indians in America. Failing, however, he resigned his bishopric in 1551, and, retiring into his monastery, wrote two books, which he dedicated to Philip II., on the tyranny of the Spaniards in the Indies, and which, scattered among the people of the Netherlands, animated them exceedingly in their revolt against Spain.

When the discoverer of America was turning with despondent heart from the Court of Castile to seek elsewhere countenance and aid for his scheme, he, like other poor travellers, applied for hospitality at the usual place, the monastery, and telling his sublime story to a monk, Juan Prez de Machena, of the Franciscan Monastery at La Rabida in Andalusia, this one comforted his soul and interceded so effectually in his favor that Ferdinand and Isabella retained for Spain the honor she was about letting slip from her grasp, of patronizing the great sailor and winning a new world for mankind.

To come to our subject. The monks as priests were the recognized mediators between the rulers and the ruled, and while they hesitated not to resist even to death the abuse of authority, they threw the full weight of their office against the destructive spirit of revolution. Thus, while the monks in England gradually united and welded into one great kingdom the petty liberties of the country, they did not scruple to take part in those free parliaments of the nation which deposed unworthy monarchs, and so taught that people that wonderful union of law and freedom of which their constitution forms so shining an example. The preaching of the faith was usually the opening work of the monks. Following this came the establishment of the monastery, wherein the traveller, the sick, the outcast, the orphan, and the poor in general received consideration, and the heart of the people was won by practical benevolence, even before their minds could yield to the strange doctrines. The number of poor, despoiled and distressed persons

in the first ages after Benedict was very great on account of the unsettled habits of the warlike hordes of invaders, and the ruin they wrought upon the property and homes of the civilized inhabitants. These poor people in their need settled around the monasteries and were preached to, prescribed for, taught letters, trades and agriculture by the monks. As these settlements grew in stability and strength, they formed towns and built splendid Cathedrals, receiving an episcopal character on account of their importance. They copied the monastery's form of government. They united with other similarly-founded towns and met in congress, and thus consolidating their powers and uniting their forces, at last compelled all the robber-knights and feudal tyrants to submit to law and order. These monasteries being often founded, for peace and solitude's sake, in remote and waste places, of which there were vast tracts in England, it came to pass that these districts were reclaimed and made flourishing by a system of agriculture so perfect that no country can boast a better.

"Indulging and training the British spirit of freedom," says Montalembert, "the monks adapted legislation to it, and the local Parliament of England rose, grew and prospered under their care. And the like being done in every monastic establishment, unity of national sentiment also developed until the seven kingdoms were united into one in the year 827, and the English people sprang into that greatness which still endures." The Sunday-rest was most vigorously maintained in favor of the serfs, and a law is to be read whereby a slave who was compelled to work on Free-day, as it was called, became *ipso facto* a freeman. This was only one of the provisions whereby the monks hampered slavery, until it was gradually abolished. The extent to which the monks took part in the public concerns may be judged from the fact that a charter of the Parliament of 934 gives us in a list of its members: four Welsh princes, two archbishops, seventeen bishops, four abbots, twelve dukes, fifty-two thanes. It must be remarked that these prelates were nearly every one promoted from the cowl. An illustration of the humanizing influence may be noted in the penalty the Commons sometimes inflicted on some repentant robber or oppressor of the poor, which was to build a church or to grant lands for the foundation of a hospice for travellers, to build a bridge, mend a road, erect cottages for the needy. Thus his expiation itself had a civilizing effect on him, and helped to teach him wherein true manliness and nobility consisted. The first general parliament met in the cloisters of the Abbey of Westminster, and twenty-nine abbots were found in the popular branch of the government; and to this day the highest deliberative assembly in the world recalls in its meeting place the glory of those who first gave it countenance,

aid and shelter.¹ Almost all of the Prime Ministers, or Chancellors as they were called, and other leading men of England, were monks, or bishops who had been chosen from monks, and they have the main credit of building up that great monarchy. Of Thomas Becket, one of them, Chancellor under Henry II., Lord Campbell in his lives of the Chancellors, after describing in admiring and graphic language the manner of his most noble death, thus concludes :

"Thus perished, in the 53d year of his age, the man who of all the English chancellors, since the foundation of the monarchy, was of the loftiest ambition, of the greatest firmness of purpose, and the most capable of making every sacrifice to a sense of duty (or for the acquisition of renown)." "He defended the spiritual against the royal authority, and we must remember that in the 11th century the cause of the Church was in fact the cause of the weak against the strong, the cause of civilization and of the people against barbarism and tyranny, and that by his contemporaries he was regarded as the champion of the oppressed Saxon race against the Norman nobility."

What is said of England is true of many other states similarly established in order, peace, and law through monastic influence. No less than three-eighths of the cities and towns of France were founded by monks and began existence with a monastery for a nucleus ; and Guizot in his "View of the Reign of Charlemagne in the ninth Century" gives a list of the celebrated men who were in his service as ministers, councillors, secretaries ; they were all ecclesiastics of the Benedictine Order. The monks were gradually trained to the government of nations, by the protection they granted to the people who built their homes in the shadow and on the lands of the monastery. They became from landlords, temporal, and spiritual rulers, though as we have seen they endeavored to leave the temporal cares in the people's own hands, and informing them with their own spirit and methods, were the cause of the free government that flourished in the guilds, free cities and numerous republics of the Middle Ages ; while the identity of system in the various monasteries brought a likeness of custom and form amongst remote tribes, and paved the way for the national unity which exists to-day. The settlements about the monastery always flourished, for the "Curse of Rome" surrounded as with a magical circle the weak fugitives from oppression, and the "peace-compelling crozier," as Disraeli calls it, "upon contending sceptres meekly dropped." They were kind landlords, living always and spending all their income upon

¹ The monks' influence in wresting Magna Charta, the Palladium of English freedom, from King John, may be estimated from the fact that its very first clause demands the liberty of the Church : "*Imprimis volumus ut Ecclesia Dei libera sit.*"

their own estates, having no other object in view than the good of their tenants. It is good to live under the crozier,—“*Unter dem Krummstal es ist gut wohnen*,” says the grateful German proverb. Did our subject allow, we might illustrate this colonizing work of the old monks by describing the achievements of the Jesuits in Paraguay in the last century, and of the Franciscans in California in this. In this connection, however, we may just touch upon their position as almoners, something that in our present system is open to misunderstanding.

“To understand and sympathize with the importance attached to almsgiving,” says Mrs. Jameson, “we must recall a social condition very different from our own: a period when there were no poor-laws; when the laws for the protection of the lower classes were imperfect and perpetually violated: when for the wretched there was absolutely no resource but in private beneficence. The laws against debtors were then very severe, and the proximity of the Moors on one side, and the Turks on the other, rendered slavery a familiar thing. In all the maritime and commercial cities of Italy and Spain brotherhoods existed for the manumission of slaves and debtors. Charitable confraternities performed then, and in Italy perform now, many duties left to our police, or which we think we fulfil in paying our poor-rates.”

There is always left abundant opportunity for charity even in our own perhaps more advanced condition, and many brotherhoods and sisterhoods in our own times labor in divers ways for the various ills that afflict humanity. There is not and never was any form of suffering for which the Church, when free to act out her spirit, did not and cannot provide alleviation, if not remedy. “He who is ignorant of the services of the monks,” says Leibnitz, “or despises them, has only a narrow and vulgar idea of virtue, and stupidly believes that he has fulfilled all his obligations towards God by some habitual practice accomplished with that coldness which excludes zeal and love.” “I never read of a hermit,” said Samuel Johnson, “but in imagination I kiss his feet, nor of a monastery, but I fall on my knees and kiss the pavement.” Let us consider the monks’ works now more in particular, and first as to their zeal for learning.

They carried the cultivation of reason to the very highest degree, as is known to those who are acquainted with the works of Thomas of Aquin, Scotus, Albert the Great, and others who have even been reproached with excessive refinement and subtlety in their researches. “The monasteries were the sole depositaries of learning and the arts through several centuries of ignorance; the collectors and transcribers of books, when a copy of the Bible was worth a king’s ransom. Before the invention of printing every Benedictine

Abbey had its library and its scriptorium or writing-chamber, where silent monks were employed from day to day, from month to month, in making transcripts of valuable works, particularly of the Scriptures; and these were either sold for the benefit of the convent, or bestowed as precious gifts, which brought a blessing equally to those who gave and those who received. Even in the seventh century we have the authority of the venerable Bede for the fact that the Scriptures in the vernacular were then circulated through their labor, while the preservation of the remains of classical literature is entirely owing to them. Their manuscripts which we still possess are marvels of excellence and beauty."

There is in the Congressional Library an old Bible of Italian origin supposed to have been written in the thirteenth or fourteenth century. It is in Latin, upon vellum in clear bold characters extremely uniform. The writing is in two columns about three inches wide with a margin of two inches. It is embellished with 146 miniature paintings, and upwards of 1200 smaller illuminations, which are beautifully executed, and are as brilliant to-day as the day they were done. The initials of books and prologues are two and a half inches in height and those of the chapters one inch. It is contained in two large volumes, and cost the government \$2,200 gold, when gold was at a high premium, and was purchased at a sale of the library of Henry Perkins, London, in 1873. The skins in the first volume have been all repaired, except five; in the second, they are nearly all perfect. It was the sight of this relic which inspired the poet of Scribner's (November, 1881) with these verses:

" Missal of the Gothic age,
Missal with the blazoned page,
Whence, O Missal, hither come,
From what dim Scriptorium?

What the name that wrought thee thus,
Ambrose or Theophilus?
Bending thro' the waning light
O'er thy vellum scraped and white;

Weaving 'twixt thy rubric lines
Sprays and leaves and quaint designs;
Setting round thy border scrolled
Buds of purple and of gold?

Ah! A wondering brotherhood,
Doubtless, round that artist stood,
Strewing o'er his careful ways
Little choruses of praise:

Glad when his deft hand would paint
Strife of Sathanas and Saint,
Or in secret coign entwist
Jest of cloister humorist.

Well the worker earned his wage
Bending o'er the blazoned page !
Tired the hand and tired the wit
'Ere the final *explicit* !

Not as ours the books of old,
Things that steam can stamp and fold ;
Not as ours the books of yore,
Rows of type and nothing more.

Then a book was still a Book
Where a wistful man might look,
Finding something through the whole
Beating like a human soul.

In that growth of day by day,
When to labor was to pray,
Surely something vital passed
To the patient page at last :

Something that one still perceives
Vaguely present in the leaves ;
Something from the worker lent,
Something mute but eloquent."

Most of the great universities, among them Oxford and Cambridge, were founded or first served by the monks. Two Irishmen came to France in 791 and founded the great centre of learning at Paris and Pavia, while in their own country they had vast schools, conducted by the cowled heads, numbering as many as 5000 students each, and frequented by scholars from every part of Europe. Ussher, Camden, and others, are authority for the statement that Alfred the Great listened to these learned Irishmen in his projects for the advancement of literature. Butler (II. 205) tells us that the English Saxons flocked to Ireland as to the mart of sacred learning, and that this is frequently mentioned in the lives of men eminent among them. Thus, in the life of Sulgenus, in the 8th century, we read:

" Exemplo fratrum commotus amore legendi—
Ivit ad Hibernos sophia mirabili claros."
" With love of learning, and example fired,
To Ireland famed for wisdom he retired."

Camden conjectures that the English Saxons borrowed their letters from the Irish, because they used the same which the Irish at this day still make use of in writing their own language. When printing came, the monks were not slow to make use of it. The first printing press in Italy was set up at the site of St. Scholastica's Monastery, about a mile from the sacred cave of Subiaco ; the first in England was in the cloisters of the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster, and there Caxton worked at his press.

The improvement of agriculture and the reclamation of waste

lands, as well as the change which they brought about by drawing away population from the large cities, wherein the Romans were wont to concentrate wealth, enlightenment, and power, to the neglect of the country, so-called, is something for which the monks deserve the greatest praise and gratitude.

"It was," says Maitland, "as we ought most gratefully to acknowledge, a most happy thing for the world that they did not confine themselves to the possession of such small estates as they cultivated with their own hands. The extraordinary benefit which they conferred on society by colonizing waste places,—places chosen because they were waste and solitary, and such as could be reclaimed only by the incessant labor of those who were willing to work hard and live hard,—lands often given because they were not worth keeping,—lands which for a long while left their cultivators half-starved and dependent on the charity of those who admired what we must too often call fanatical zeal,—even the extraordinary benefit, I say, which they conferred on mankind by thus clearing and cultivating, was small in comparison with the advantages derived from them by society, after they had become large proprietors, landlords with more benevolence, and farmers with more intelligence and capital than any others."

"The Benedictines were the first agriculturists who brought intellectual resources, calculation, and science to bear on the cultivation of the soil; to whom we owe experimental farming and gardening, and the introduction of a variety of new vegetables, fruits, etc." Guizot styles the Benedictines *les défricheurs*, "breakers of new land;" *pioniers de l'Europe*: wherever they carried the cross they carried also the plough. The Isle of Jersey, in the Channel, was a desert when granted to the monks, who cultivated it with such skill and success that it produced the finest cattle, perhaps, in the world, and is six times as densely populated as France.

Another of their modes of proceeding may be seen from a visit to the Abbey of Mt. Mellaray, County of Waterford, in Ireland, on the desolate heights of a mountain, where the land was poor and covered with heather. They reclaimed it, planted trees, and now have a large farm and good buildings, having domestics, mechanics, and indeed all necessities for a colony in their own community. We visited their place recently, and found that they had also a boarding school with two boys from New York, and a parish school with 190 children of the poor mountaineers, whom they daily fed with their own fare, bread, milk, and vegetables. These monks have establishments in the United States, and we read that the farmers near Dubuque go to the Trappists to buy the best seed.

Of another famous Order, Mrs. Jameson thus writes: "The spare diet of the Carthusians, their rigorous seclusion, and their habits of labor, give them an emaciated look, a pale quietude, in which, however, there is no feebleness, no appearance of ill health or squalor; I never saw a Carthusian monk who did not look like a gentleman. They were the first and greatest horticulturists of Europe; of them it may be especially said that, where they settled, they 'made the desert blossom as the rose.' When they built their first nest under the heights of Chartreux, they converted the stony waste into a garden. When they were set down among the marshes of Pavia, they drained, they tilled, they planted, till the unhealthy swamp was clothed, for miles around, with beauty and fertility."

Familiarity with nature, and meditation on divine things, made the love of beauty to burn strongly in the bosoms of the monks. But it was not carnal beauty. They chose sites of remarkable attractiveness of form for their establishments, though the soil was generally barren and rocky, but devoted all their energies thereafter to making it a delightful home for the soul to rest in during her pilgrimage in this world. Their architecture was grand in the highest degree; their patronage of the fine arts could not be surpassed. Speaking of this latter, Jameson says:

"There was one vocation common to all the great religious orders. The Benedictines instituted schools of learning; the Augustinians built noble cathedrals; the mendicant orders founded hospitals; *all* became patrons of the fine arts on such a scale of magnificence that the protection of the most renowned princes has been mean and insignificant in comparison. Yet, in their relation to Art, this splendid patronage was the least of their merits. The earliest artists of the Middle Ages were the monks themselves, of the Benedictine Order. In their convents were preserved, from age to age, the traditional treatment of sacred subjects, and that pure unworldly sentiment which, in later times, was ill-exchanged for the learning of schools and the competition of academies; and as they were the only depositories of chemical and medical knowledge, and the only compounders of drugs, we owe to them also the discovery and preparation of some of the finest colors, and the invention or the improvement of the implements used in painting; for "monks not only prepared their own colors," says Eastlake, in his "History of Oil Painting," "but when they employed secular painters, in decorating their convents, the materials, furnished from their own laboratories were, consequently, of the best and most durable kind." As architects, as glass-painters, as mosaic workers, as carvers in wood and metal, they were the precursors of all that has since been achieved in Christian Art; and if so few of these admir-

able and gifted men are known to us individually and by name, it is because they work for the honor of God and their community,—not for profit nor for reputation. Theophilus, the monk, whose most curious and important treatise on the fine arts and chemistry was written in the 12th century, and lately republished in France and England, was a Benedictine. Friar Roger Bacon was a Franciscan, Albert the Great a Dominican. It is on record that the knowledge of physics attained by these two remarkable men exposed them to the charge of magic.

Munich may be almost said to-day to be the capital of the fine arts. Its name signifies the city of the monks, and doubtless their spirit it is that gives it preëminence for taste and skill.

We often find the monks giving the young painter his first start on the path of wealth and fame, for if he succeeded in one convent, his reputation and the demand for his works soon spread wherever the brethren were located.

“When Murillo returned from Madrid to his native Seville, poor and unknown, the Franciscans were the first to patronize him, and gave him the small sum one of their brothers had collected for painting their cloister; he thus laid the foundation of his fame, and afterwards, when famous, gratefully painted twenty of his finest pictures for the Franciscan Capuchins in Seville.” “The Jesuits employed Rubens and Van Dyke to decorate their splendid church at Antwerp.”

This tradition remains in Religious Orders, and to-day even in our young Republic, as well as in Canada, if you would see the finest paintings and statuary, you had better ask for the church of this or that community.

Allied to church decoration is music. Here, also, they have made the world their debtor.

The monks invented the musical system called after one of them, Pope Gregory the Great, its patron, the Gregorian Chant, which Prof. Ritter, of Vassar College, styled the very university of music, as if it contained all the art and the basis of every one of its perfect forms. Their prayer itself obliged them to be musical; for every day they had to sing the psalms in choir, and if you would know the beauty of divine worship, you must see and hear a choir of monks. Mozart is reported to have said: “I would give up all my reputation as a musician to be considered the author of the Plain Chant Preface.” The music was performed in magnificently designed and decorated churches, to many or most of which even the Cathedral of New York merely approaches in grandeur and internal beauty. Speaking of the action of Henry VIII. and his successors, Mrs. Jameson thus waxes hot and eloquent, and with reason: ‘We cannot but revolt against the rapacity of Henry VIII. and

his minions, followed afterwards by the blind fanaticism of the Puritans, which swept from the face of the land almost every memorial which was either convertible into money or within reach of the sacrilegious hand. Of Henry and his motives we can think only with disgust and horror. The Puritans were at least religiously in earnest, and if we cannot sympathize with them, we can at least understand their hatred of a faith which had filled the world with the scandal of its pernicious abuses, while the knowledge or the comprehension of all the benefits it had bestowed on our land lay beyond the mental vision of any Praise-God Barebones, or any heavenly-minded tinker or stern Covenanter of Cromwell's army. When I recall the history of the ecclesiastical potentates of Italy in the sixteenth century, I could almost turn Puritan myself; but when I think of all the wondrous and beautiful productions of human skill, all the memorials of the great and gifted men of old, the humanizers and civilizers of our country, which once existed, and of which our great cathedrals, noble and glorious as they are even now, are but the remains, it is with a very cordial hatred of the profane savage ignorance which destroyed and desecrated them."

Beauty and duration were two characteristics of their edifices, and there can be no doubt that England owes much of its conservatism, liberty, wealth, and strength, to the impression made on it by its numberless monasteries and the first-class men they produced in the spiritual and temporal orders. She has had a little more taste too in preserving at least the fair ruins of her abbeys which intensify and heighten the magical effect of "Old England," make her scenery the most lovely and delightful in Christendom, inspire her poets, architects, and landscape painters, and throw a mighty and powerful charm over the patriotic hearts of her sons. A few lines from Scott's "Marmion" may give a pleasant idea of this strength:

"The Ancient Monastery's halls,
A solemn, huge, and dark-red pile,
Placed on the margin of the isle.
In Saxon strength that Abbey frowned
With massive arches broad and round,
That rose alternate row on row,
On ponderous columns, short and low,
Built ere the art was known,
By pointed aisle and shafted stalk,
The arcades of an alley walk
To emulate in stone,
On the deep walls the heathen Dane
Had poured his impious rage in vain,
And needful was such strength to these
Exposed to the tempestuous seas,
Scourged by the winds' eternal sway,
Open to rovers fierce as they,
Which could twelve hundred years withstand
Wind, waves, and northern pirates' hand.

Not but that portion of the pile
 Rebuilt in a later style
 Showed where the spoiler's hand had been;
 Not but the wasting sea-breeze keen
 Had worn the pillar's carving quaint,
 And mouldered in his niche the saint,
 And rounded with consuming power
 The pointed angles of each tower;
 Yet still entire the Abbey stood
 Like veteran worn but unsubdued."

Then hear his lines on fair Melrose's beautiful window:

"The moon on the east oriel shone,
 Thro' slender shafts of shapely stone
 By foliage tracery combined;
 Thou wouldst have thought some fairy hand,
 'Twixt poplars straight, the osier wand
 In many a freakish knot had twined,
 Then framed a spell when the work was done,
 And changed the willow-wreaths to stone!"

Leland saw the Abbey at St. Edmundsbury, built by Canute in 1020, in its splendor: "The sun hath not seen a city more finely seated, or a goodlier abbey, whether a man considers the revenues and endowments, or the largeness and incomparable magnificence thereof. A man who saw the abbey would verily say it were a city: so many gates there are in it, and some of brass, so many towers, and a most stately church, upon which attend three other churches, all of passing fine and curious workmanship." The monks are the authors of Gothic architecture. Their abbey churches are still numerous in England, the most known to fame being that at Westminster, which is a marvel in the richest and most enlightened city of the world now six hundred years after its building.¹

If architecture be a proper test of civilization, then the monks were very highly civilized indeed, and fostered this department in the most lavish and unlimited degree. Their churches are called by some one "poems, epics in stone," an open book of endless instruction and unceasing delight to all degrees of men. There is no doubt that every advancement in the greatness and beauty of public buildings, especially churches, tends to improve the

¹ Christopher Wren, the architect of St. Paul's, London, acknowledged the surpassing skill of the monkish builders. Of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, which has a groined arched roof, some of the keystones of which are estimated to weigh twenty tons each, he admitted that he could not surmise how they were laid; and at St. Michael's, Coventry, there is a spire standing on open brackets, so lofty, tapering and beautiful, that it is said he exclaimed on seeing it, "that it was hung in the air by fairies and could not have been built by mortal hands."

morals, refine the taste, and elevate the general condition of the people.

A Protestant gentleman who had finished his education in Europe and knew whence the highest training came, said to the writer that Congress should thank the builders of the New York Cathedral for that comparatively splendid achievement of æsthetic zeal and artistic culture. All Christendom should be grateful to the monks for similar and many more reasons, and all of learned Christendom is so. Omitting for brevity's sake much else that might be found detailed in the authors quoted, as well as in countless others, in praise of the old monastic institutions, let us glance at the causes of their decline and fall. Their number in England alone was very great, and their property extensive. Henry the Uxorious, eighth of the name, has the credit or the infamy of having destroyed these valuable foundations, sequestered their revenues and bestowed their lands upon his willing tools, besides scattering or putting to death many of the monks who refused to apostatize after the royal example from the faith of their and his forefathers. After all his confiscation, however, there remained for Edward VI. to suppress in his brief reign 90 colleges, 110 hospitals, besides other such places. The revenues of the monks may have amounted nominally to a fifth part of those of the nation, but considering the leases they granted upon small rents, perhaps not to a tenth. "Monasteries in England are no more," says the English Bishop Tanner, "yet justice is due to an order of men which was formerly an illustrious part of our nation, and abounded with persons eminent for both learning and piety. The veil which death casts over the ashes of great and good men is sacred, and to cast dirt upon their shrine is shocking to the most savage barbarian." Bishop Burnet says the monks were become lewd and dissolute when their order was suppressed among us. But Wharton in his "Specimen of Errors in Burnet's History of the Reformation" says: "God forbid that any professor of Christianity, much less the greatest pretenders to it, shall be guilty of such monstrous wickedness, or that any others should believe it of them without sufficient proof. Surely if the monks had been guilty of any such thing, it could not have escaped the knowledge of their visitors, who searched and divulged all their faults with the utmost industry. Nor would it have been unknown to Bale, brought up amongst them, nor omitted by him in his "English Votaries," wherein he hath set himself to defame the monastic order and the unmarried clergy with unsatiable malice." Answering Burnet's charge regarding the wealth of the monks, he says: "As for the best part of the soil being in such ill hands, and its being for the interest of the nation to have it put to better uses, this is altogether erroneous. From

the beginning to the end none ever improved their lands and possessions to better advantage than the monks, by building, cultivation, and all other methods. Of this Croyland is to this day a manifest instance. And when they leased them out to others, it was the interest of the nation to have such easy tenures continued to great numbers of persons who enjoyed them. To this it may be added that they contributed to the public charges of the nation equally with the other clergy; and the clergy did always contribute in proportion *above* the laity. So that we cannot find to what better uses these possessions have been since put," etc.

Froude himself, of the Charterhouse monks and of their prior who was put to death in Edward's reign because he would not acknowledge the royal supremacy in spirituals, thus writes: "The hospitality of the Carthusian fathers was well sustained; the charities were profuse. . . . The monks were true to their vows, and true to their duty as far as they comprehended what duty meant. Amongst many good monks the prior, John Houghton, was the best. He was of an old English family, and had been educated at Cambridge, where he must have been a contemporary of Hugh Latimer. At the age of eight and twenty he took the vows of a monk, and had been twenty years a Carthusian at the opening of the troubles of the Reformation. John Houghton is described as small in stature, in figure graceful, in countenance dignified. In manner he was modest, in eloquence most sweet, in chastity without a stain. We may readily imagine his appearance, with that feminine austerity of expression which, it has been well said, belongs so peculiarly to the features of the mediæval ecclesiastics."

However true it be, as it is true, that characters such as here described were still to be found, and were even numerous in the monasteries, nevertheless it must be admitted, as Montalembert shows, that many abuses had crept into, or rather been forced upon, those of England as well as of France and Italy. Every human institution has within it a germ of decay, or this is of parasitical growth and is planted by the avarice and ambition of men. It is no reproach to monasticism, which ever and again springs up with renewed and purified life when relieved of its sinful embarrassments, but it is its fate, as of the Church herself, to become entangled with individuals, families, and the state. They cannot long let her alone. She is always the same, and she is immortal. She appeals to the highest motives in the heart of man, and as she is catholic in respect to providing for all his needs, her influence must ever grow, her means for doing good always extend. It is especially difficult for her to avoid becoming rich, and riches are the bane of churchmen. In their poverty lies their strength. But the ambitious and avaricious of the world cannot see with indifference

the power and wealth of the Church, and desire to possess and use for their own base, selfish purposes what should be used for that of the poor and the oppressed. Hence they try to enter the ecclesiastical career, and the worst state of things is reached when the crozier is in the hands of the worldling. The same tendency may be predicated of monasticism. The jealous nobles did not care to embrace the cowl and sandals, the abstinence and obedience themselves, so they began to assume the title without the reality, and to warp the power, riches and influence of the monasteries to their own private ends. There were other reasons also why this interference took place, which will be plain from the conclusion of the frank and eloquent author of the "*Monks of the West.*" We give the substance of his words :

"On account of the multitude of nobles who became monks and brought their estates with them, of childless knights who left them their possessions, of the great populations which grew up in the rich and fertile surroundings of the monastery, it came to pass that too large a part of the people was exempt from military service, and from all imposts except those of war, bridges and fortresses. The Venerable Bede complains already in the first century of their existence, that this was going too far, especially as some actually obtained grants and built monasteries which they filled with unfrocked monks, and, laymen as they were, married and living in luxury, called themselves Abbots and obtained exemption from military service and ordinary taxes, and these they handed down to their heirs. Afterwards kings began to give the title and revenues of monasteries to their own sons, to those of their favorites and other knaves who were mere laymen and often profligates. Thus early was begun that horrible abuse which was afterwards carried to such excess that we read of one noble youth who was Commendatory Abbot of twelve monasteries. The legitimate monks themselves also began to put on superfluous ornament, to relax discipline in various ways, as we know from the Councils of the Church in their decrees against these excesses. The very giving of alms was carried to excess, and did harm sometimes to the recipient—as well as to the donor, who seemed to imagine that he had bought liberty to sin by his generosity to the monks.

"The vast possessions of the monks, too, awakened covetousness. The heirs at law of the Abbot sometimes seized the lands after his death, under pretence that it was his property, and that they had a right to its inheritance on the sole condition of supporting the monks. Kings, too, sometimes installed themselves in a monastery for rest and recreation with a vast retinue of nobles and huntsmen, eating the fat of the land and bringing ruin to quiet, prayer, study and discipline. Often they fell in love with the place and seques-

tered it, an example frequently followed by the powerful nobles. Even the prelates themselves were carried away now and then by avarice, and made over to their relatives portions of the conventual domain. The frequent wars of civil strife and foreign conquest caused various fluctuations in the fortunes of these institutions, which, being always the best cultivated and the most populous, offered a more attractive prey. The perseverance of the monks, however, their laborious and economical system, their paternal care of the agricultural population, were almost always sufficient to restore their fortunes, and their influence and usefulness continued, more or less impaired, until the time when Henry VIII. and his immediate successors suppressed them and seized all their property. Voluntary poverty has always been the unfailing source of the influence and power of the monks. In their weakness lies their strength. Had the ecclesiastical rulers of England been careful to prevent increase of wealth, though it is impossible for a never dying society like the Church or those institutions which draw their vitality from her to avoid the occasion thereof, a vast amount of scandal, heresy and sin would have been spared Christendom."

Though often and ever suppressed and even destroyed, monasteries rise again always and speedily. The Church, like nature, soon heals her wounds and reappears after a brief winter or two as young, vigorous and fruitful as ever. Monastic institutions invariably spring up where the Church is founded. Forty years after the Revolution of '93, hundreds of them were again founded in France, to be again destroyed, to revive again. Our own young country contains several hundreds of convents of various orders already, having the same spirit as of old, but working according to the needs of the times. The advanced civilization of the nineteenth century does not need the same assistance as the rude periods which required Benedict and Francis, but in every age there is work for the monks, and every generation needs the brilliant example of the gospel virtues as shown forth in their profession and practice, their faith and works.

EDWARD HYDE AND HIS DAUGHTER.

1. *Life and Administration of Edward, First Earl of Clarendon*, with Original Correspondence and Authentic Papers. London: Thomas H. Lister.
2. *An Account of his Life*, written by himself. London.
3. *An Historical Inquiry Respecting the Character of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon*. By the Hon. Agar Ellis. London.

"THIS I consider to be the principal use of annals, that instances of virtue may be recorded, and that by the dread of future infamy and the censures of posterity men may be deterred from depravity in word and deed. But such was the pestilential character of those times, so contaminated with adulation, that not only the first nobles, whose obnoxious splendor found protection only in obsequiousness, but all who had been consuls, a great part of such as had been prætors, and even many of the inferior senators strove for priority in the fulsomeness and extravagance of their votes. There is a tradition that Tiberius, as often as he went out of the Senate, was wont to cry out in Greek, 'How fitted for slavery are these men!' Yes, even Tiberius, the enemy of public liberty, nauseated the crouching tameness of his slaves."

THIS lesson, taught by the virtuous Tacitus in his "Annals," has often been neglected. Not always do men, even those most gifted with foresight, profit by the experiences of others even when following on the very lines that led to disaster. With the vicious it is easier to hope for impunity than to turn themselves from evil ways. That Tiberius and his minions should have cared not enough for the judgment of posterity was unfortunate, notwithstanding the doubts of that age regarding a future life. For good men, even of heathen nations, have ever been found to hope that their names and memories would live in the favorable speeches of survivors.

But what shall we think of such disregard among Christian peoples, among a people who were not only Christian, but who had taken upon themselves to reform the whole Christian Church with allegations that it had dishonored its Founder; among a people who had been unmolested in their work of reformation for one hundred and fifty years, in the last twenty of which those who had been most pronounced in their denunciations of Christian conduct of every kind, in high places after the attainment of power, had slain a wicked king, and in the commonwealth built upon his ruin made laws for the suppression of every species of iniquity, and then, as if fatigued with their own work and responsibilities, called back the exiled son of their deceased ruler with invocations of the blessings of God?

The period of the Restoration is in some respects the most interesting in British history. Indeed, in all history can hardly be found more rapid and eventful changes in some of the most important elements of a nation's being. Recalled because the people had been made sick nigh unto death under Puritan rule, without genius for empire, incapable, apparently not desirous to become a warrior or a statesman, Charles II. took the crown that had been offered to him, and entered upon a career that was singularly eventful. There was an opportunity for a most beneficent ruler if he could have been surrounded by ministers wise, patriotic, and courageous, who would have led him to endeavors to avoid the mistakes of his ancestors. With a monarch not more inclined to shed blood for the violence done to the dynasty of his family, it seems curious that obsequiousness in courtiers was as base as ever it had been under the rule of the worst Roman emperors. The House of Commons, composed mainly of Presbyterians and Independents, in a body must make haste to prostrate themselves before their gracious master, declare that words were inadequate to express their sense of the heinousness of the sins that had been committed against sacred majesty, and after obtaining forgiveness for themselves clamor for a more condign punishment than he seemed inclined to inflict upon others who had been as guilty, but less abject.

The Prime Minister was a man formed by nature for a noble work. In different circumstances he might have achieved what would have made him be numbered among the greatest statesmen. First an opposer of the most arbitrary measures of Charles I., having joined in the impeachment of the Earl of Strafford, he turned at length from the violent party of the people, followed into exile the son, was his chief counsellor during that period, returned with him when called back to his father's throne, and led the administration until his ungrateful master gave him up to the clamors of new favorites and drove him into a second exile wherein he was to die. During this last period he got what solace was possible in writing his "History of the Great Rebellion" and the "Account of His Own Life." The latter work we propose now to consider briefly, particularly the part referring to the marriage of his daughter Anne.

Behavior like that of which Edward Hyde, then Lord Clarendon, wrote with his own hand it would not be easy to find in the biography of any parent, at least one approximating his rank. Whoever reads of this, as well in the father's own "Account," as in the concurrent memoirs of those times, must have, we should suppose, opinions concerning King James II. somewhat different from those generally held. If the father of Anne Hyde was not sincere

in the feeling he expressed on first hearing of the connection between her and the Duke of York, his utterances were sufficiently base. If he was sincere, it would be hardly more than justice to characterize him as the most shamelessly unnatural of all fathers of whom history has transmitted account.

There is something in feminine honor that ever has seemed to call from the male sex an amount of tender respect, and of the taking of risks for its defence, that are required by no other human condition. Particularly has this been the case with maidens. The dishonor of wives, indeed, has always been regarded with horror, but to all manful minds that of daughters has seemed yet more appalling. Mankind praised the high-born Lucretia for the revenge she took for enduring the insult of Tarquinius; but higher was the laudation of the humble centurion who, by making himself childless, saved his daughter from outrage by the proud Decemvir. The world holds in scorn the husband who condones the ruin of his wife; but there is no depth to its detestation of the parent who tolerates, much less connives at, that of his daughter. We are now contemplating, it is true, a period wherein social and domestic virtues, especially among the highest circles, were as low, or almost as low, as they have ever been among any people of whom we have published accounts. Yet among all the evil examples which that notable period has transmitted, the case of Anne Hyde to us appears the worst.

In order to mitigate as much as possible her father's conduct, and bring it to that degree wherein it may seem the conduct at least of a human being, not of a devil, we must assume (what indeed is most probable) that the father was acting throughout a part of unmixed duplicity, and that the last results, though following so contrary to his counsels and pretended wishes, were such as he had long premeditated and eagerly hoped to see attained. Such assumptions must be taken and allowed sometimes in order to make certain things credible. For there be some things, as Horace warned the young Pisos, that are so monstrous that a person of ordinary virtue and credulity cannot forbear, while listening to their recital, to exclaim, "INCREDULUS ODI!"

Yet, let it be remarked that this assumption is taken in spite of the fact that the "Account" was drawn up ten years after the occurrences described, and while the father was languishing in exile in a foreign country.

There is much in the first appointment of Anne Hyde in the household of the Princess of Orange that "sounds of fraud." To the suggestion of O'Neil that he should apply in her behalf for the place, "Hyde answered" (as said in the "Account") "that he had but one daughter, who was all the comfort and company

her mother had in her melancholic retirement, and therefore he was resolved not to separate them, nor to dispose his daughter to a court life." Yet, when the family-friend's interest had prevailed, and an offer was made by the Princess and the King, her brother, the father, though still professing disinclination, left the decision to the mother, who quickly enough accepted.

A father apprehensive of the influence of court life upon an only daughter soon had reason to feel more so from the praise everywhere bestowed upon her. In a few months after her appointment the Queen of Bohemia wrote:

"We had a Royaltie, though not upon twelf night, at Teiling. Mrs. Hide was a shepherdess, and I assure you was verie handsome in it. None but her mistress looked better than she did. I believe my Lady Hide and the Chancellour will not be sorie to heare it." And afterwards: "I pray remember me to Mr. Chancellour, and tell him his ladie and my favorit, his daughter, came hither upon Saturday, and are gone this day to Teiling. I finde my favorit growen everie way to her advantage."

In spite of anxieties which must have been sharpened by such glowing accounts of the gifts of the new maid of honor in public impersonations of poetic characters, there seemed never to have been as much as a thought of withdrawing her, and she was suffered to continue "growen everie way to her advantage."

Anne Hyde was not a beauty; but she had the understanding, culture, and manners that often captivate more than beauty of person. These, on the occasion of a visit paid by the Princess to the Queen mother at Paris, attracted the Duke of York, to whose suit she lent a willing, but entirely honorable consent, and, upon the return to Breda, signed with him a contract of marriage which after the Restoration was secretly ratified at Worcester House, her father's residence, the bride having been given away by the Lord Ossory. Some circumstances there were, not necessary to be mentioned here, that would seem to have made it impossible for the Chancellor not to know the relations of Anne to the Duke.¹

¹ Things far less significant than many which must have come constantly within the Chancellor's observation had raised suspicion outside of his family. In Locke's "Memoirs of Lord Shaftsbury" occurs the following: "Soon after the Restoration of King Charles II., the Earl of Southampton and Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, having dined together at the Chancellor's, as they were returning home, Sir A. said to my Lord Southampton, 'Yonder Mrs. Anne Hyde is certainly married to one of the 'Brothers.'" The Earl, who was a friend to the Chancellor, treated this as a chintz, and asked him how so wild a fancy could get into his head. 'Assure yourself' (replied he) 'it is so. A concealed respect (however suppressed) showed itself so plainly in the looks, voice, and manner wherewith her mother carved to her, or offered her of every dish, that it is impossible but it must be so.' My Lord S., who thought it a groundless conceit then, was not long after convinced, by the Duke of York's owning of her, that Lord Ashley was no bad guesser."

However, we shall see how he admits to have behaved when the latter demanded of his brother the right to publish his marriage, and the Chancellor, Lords Ormond and Southampton had been summoned for consultation touching the demand. It would be not easy, we believe, to match the following extracts from an autobiography:

"The first matter of general and public importance, and which resulted not from any debate in Parliament, was the discovery of a great affection the Duke had for the Chancellor's daughter, who was a maid of honor to the King's sister, the Princess Royal of Orange, and of a contract of marriage between them, with which nobody was so surprised and confounded as the Chancellor himself, who, being of a nature far from jealousy and very confident of an entire affection and obedience from all his children, and particularly from that daughter whom he had loved dearly, never had in the least degree suspected any such thing, though he knew afterwards that the Duke's affection and kindness had been much spoken of beyond seas, but without the least suspicion in any body that it could ever tend to marriage. . . . But now upon this discovery and the consequence thereof, he looked upon himself as a ruined person, and that the King's indignation ought to fall upon him as the contriver of that indignity to the crown, which on himself from his soul he abhorred, and would have had the presumption of his daughter punished with the utmost severity, so he believed the whole kingdom would be influenced by the punishment of it and to prevent the dishonor which might result from it. And the least calamity that he expected upon himself and his family, how innocent soever, was an everlasting banishment out of the kingdom and to end his days in foreign parts in poverty and misery. . . .

"The manner of the Chancellor receiving this advertisement made it evident enough that he was struck with it to the heart, and had never had the least jealousy or apprehension of it. He broke out into a very immoderate passion at the wickedness of his daughter, and said with all imaginable earnestness that as soon as he came home he would turn her out of his house as——"

But some of his words were too shocking to be transcribed upon a clean page. The other lords in council, it seems, endeavored to mitigate somewhat this mighty indignation, and called his attention to the fact that the Duke had admitted the marriage, and that the business in hand was not for devising how the marriage might be prevented, but of what was to be done in existing circumstances. The monstrousness of such a *mesalliance* on honorable terms at first had seemed incredible to the outraged parent, who, we must conclude from his own words, could easily bear that the grandson who was shortly to appear should come with the mark of in-

effaceable infamy upon his innocent front, but not that one so low-born should enter among the possibilities of an eventual wearing of the crown. When the awful fact of marriage was mentioned, what must he do? He told what he did, and he told it long afterwards when himself was an exile, and that same daughter was in the enjoyment of wifehood and motherhood obtained by faithful compliance with every behest of honor and religion.

"Whereupon he fell into new commotions and said, if that were true, he were well prepared to advise what was to be done."

It makes one shudder to read what he says as to what in this daughter's case he would prefer than for that mighty dynasty to be dishonored and endangered by a public acknowledgment of such a marriage. Any disgrace upon himself and his family he could endure, but none inflicted upon those in whom was the divine right. "The indignity to himself he would submit to the good pleasure of God. But if there were any reason to suspect the other, he was ready to give a positive judgment in which he hoped their lordships would concur with him, that the King should immediately cause the woman to be sent to the Tower, and to be cast into a dungeon under so strict a guard that no person living should be permitted to come to her; and then that an act of Parliament should be immediately passed for the cutting off her head, to which he would not only give his consent, but would be very willingly the first man that should propose it. And whoso knew the man will believe that he said this very heartily. . . . I had rather submit and bear this disgrace with all humility than that it should be repaired by making her his wife, the thought whereof I do so much abominate that I had rather see her dead with all the infamy that is due to her presumption."

Even the consoling words of the king, which could not be restrained at sight of the injured father's "swollen eyes from whence a flood of tears were fallen," were answered with chidings for his too great clemency.

"Your Majesty is too easy and gentle a nature, to contend with those rough affronts which the iniquity and license of the late times is like to put upon you before it be subdued and reformed."

We will believe, for the honor of fatherhood, that these horribly unnatural words, and others worse which we cannot transcribe, were, simply, the grossest lies, uttered for the purpose of hiding his joy at the consummation of hopes that were the fondest he had ever indulged. It must have been gratifying to the family and friends that, not long afterwards, the sorrowful wailer was able to lift his head, if only a trifle, when the king put into his hands, privately, a gift of twenty thousand pounds.

"This bounty, flowing from the king at such a melancholic

junction, and of which nobody could have notice, could not but raise the spirits of the Chancellor."

If ever a man was sorely tempted to use the opportunities extended for putting away his wife, it surely was the Duke of York. The repugnance of the king, that, more trying still, of the Princess of Orange and the Queen mother, the condemnation of Hyde by his enemies in spite of his disclaiming of complicity, above all, the audacious plot of Sir George Berkeley, his master of horse, with Jermyn, Talbot, Killigrew, and Lord Arran, to disgust him by blackening his wife's name with charges of familiarities of which themselves had been recipients,—all these shook his resolution; but only for a brief time. To the good fortune of the innocent woman, the man by whom she had been espoused, whatever were his infirmities, and however he may have been supposed to tire of her society, was of a religious faith that held the marriage bond to be indissoluble, except by the act of God. Fortunate, also, it was that the stories of her infidelities were told with circumstantialities so manifestly absurd that they were obliged to be discredited. For a time, indeed, the duke was perplexed in the extreme by painful doubts. For a husband, if he doubts, or if, to his knowledge, others doubt of the honor that is most precious to him, suffers as a manful spirit can suffer from no other cause. But his incertitude happily was of brief duration. The very grossness of the charges dispelled all suspicion, and the sooner brought about the public acknowledgment, every day's delay of which added to the injuries of a woman whose innocence was her only possession that had made her capable to endure them.

A graphic account was given of this by the Duc de Grammont, in his "*Memoires*." With the pleasantry of a looker-on at events which only amused him, he speaks of the accusers as "*tous gens d'honneur, mais qui préféroient infiniment celui du Duc de York à celui de Mademoiselle Hyde*." After reciting the foul calumnies, and the summons, almost immediately after this utterance, received by Lord Ossory and Sir George Berkeley to attend the Duke at the residence of the Lord Chancellor, he thus concludes:

"*Ils trouvèrent à leur marquée son Altesse dans la chambre de Mademoiselle Hyde, ses yeux paroisoient mouillés de quelques larmes qu'elle s'efforçoit de retenir. Le Chancelier, appuyé contre la muraille, leur parut bouffi de quelque chose. Ils ne doutèrent point que ce ne fût de rage et de désespoir. Ex Le Duc d'York leur dit, de cet air content et serein dont on annonce les bonnes nouvelles, 'Commes vous êtes les deux hommes de la Cour que j'estime le plus, je veux que vous ayez les premières l'honneur de saluer la Duchesse d'York. La voila.'*"

Small place, either in histories or contemporary memoirs, was

given to the young woman who had been so sorely tried. That she suffered keenly, we cannot doubt. For there are some injuries that, upon the innocent, inflict anguish that the guilty never feel, even under the hardest blows. Yet, in the midst of her sorrow in secret silence, the hope must have been strong in her breast that the deliverance she prayed for would come in the good time of God. Not yet being, not yet daring to be, a Catholic herself, she yet could not fail to know the solemn, the awful inviolability in which the Church of her husband held the bond of marriage. In the inconstancy of his sex, in the fears concerning her honor by which he had been racked, he might suffer her to fall a victim under the act which her unnatural father was ready to propose in Parliament; but she knew that she could never be a repudiated wife of him to whom she had given her entire self; and so she waited with the patience by which Heaven supports the pure in heart, whom, with purposes wise and merciful, it sometimes allows to be afflicted and persecuted.

Her behavior, after this public recognition, was like what we have read in the lives of saints, and nowhere else. Forgiveness is a solemn duty, and when practised without grudge or reservation, a great virtue. But there was something almost more than human in that extended to those false witnesses by the woman whom they had so foully wronged. At least, it went to the extremest human possibilities, not only when they were all forgiven by the husband and the wife, but when the wife bestowed praise upon conduct which, as she graciously said, had been acted solely in the cause of the safety of her dearest lord. For the knight, Sir George Berkeley, destined for yet higher honors, had so pleaded in justification of his confessed perjuries.

There can be little doubt that these assertions of Chancellor Hyde about his preferring the death and disgrace of his only daughter to her becoming the acknowledged wife of the Duke of York, were wholly false. Their sincerity would have been monstrous, even if his fears of the ruin that the marriage would bring upon himself had been well founded. There might have been something, we must hope there was, in a father's instinct to shield his offspring from threatened condign punishment by himself taking the lead in damnable epithets to a degree that sometimes diverts the vengeance in pursuit and leaves open a way for pity towards a victim so entirely friendless. But such conduct, pardonable in some cases, was wholly unnecessary in the case of one who knew, as this man must have known, the extent of his power and influence. This is apparent from what he wrote of the hostility of the Queen mother to the match, so fiercely pronounced at first, but destined soon to subside into a most proper motherly affec-

tion. There is much sarcasm, covert as it tried to keep itself, in rehearsing the speech of the Queen, who, in hot haste, had come over from Paris, to put her foot upon the nefarious alliance, that "whenever that woman should be brought into Whitehall by one door, her majesty would go out of it at another door, and never come into it again," and how, afterwards, she received from Cardinal Mazarin a significant warning, "that she would not receive a good welcome in France if she left her sons in her displeasure, and professed an animosity against those ministers who were most trusted by the king." This intimation, in briefest time, wrought a change in the bearing of the offended Henrietta Maria. On the day before that set for her return, the Duke presented his wife, when, as reported by the gossipy Pepys, "the Queen is said to receive her now with much respect and love."

The duplicity of the great minister appears to have been chronic. He was yet only Chancellor Hyde. The King had several times proposed a peerage, telling him, as he says, "he was assured by many of the lords that it was most necessary for his service in the Parliament." Eagerly as he desired this honor, his instinctive caution made him decline then; but he gave his promise that he would accept at some future time, a promise that he faithfully kept.

The bride who, through so many difficulties, had risen so high, was destined to bear many children, to see four of them die in childhood, to meet an early death herself. Doubtless she never so much as dreamed that two of her surviving offspring would succeed their father on the English throne. It seemed like one of the dispositions of Nemesis, that when the last of these should de cease, those of her high-born successor should see the diadem revert through two generations to a kinsman not only distant, but a foreigner.

From the time of his daughter's marriage the rise of Hyde was rapid. Under a virtuous and courageous sovereign such a minister could have done well for his country. His tastes and his feelings were sincerely against the disgusting immoralities of the court and the age. It must have been painful to him very often to feel obliged to connive at actions that shocked his moral sense; yet he was too fond of power even to insist upon those which would have been for the honor and glory of the nation. He could not but have foreseen how that first secret borrowing of money from the French monarch would result in a dependency that would forever disgrace a reign in which, next to the sovereign, he was enacting the leading part. Then not only his moral sense, but that of his manhood, must have revolted at the brutalities inflicted upon the unhappy Catharine of Braganza from the very beginning to the

very end of her married life. He did, indeed, feebly remonstrate against the King's action in making the infamous Lady Castlemaine a maid of the bedchamber of the pious woman whom he had lately married. Of her, shortly after his marriage, the King had written thus, after much indelicate but hearty praise of her personal attractiveness: "I thinke myself very happy, for I am confident our two humours will agree very well together," and "I cannot easily tell you how happy I thinke myself; and I must be the worst man living (which I hope I am not) if I be not a good husband." Yet one month was sufficient to cloy him who had no relish for happiness honorably obtained. Let us see how he can write after one month to the minister who had humbly counselled against the course he had already shown his intention to pursue.

"I forgott when you were heere last, to desire you to give Brodericke¹ good counsell not to meddle any more with what concerns my Lady Castlemaine, and to let him have a care how he is the authorre of any scandalous reports; for if I finde him guilty of any such thing, I will make him repent it to the last moment of his life. And now I am entered on this matter, I thinke it very necessary to give you a little good counsell in it, least you may thinke that by making a further stirr in the business you may divert me from my resolution, which all the world shall never do; and I wish I may be unhappy in this world and in the world to come, if I faile in the least degree what I have resolved; which is of making my Lady Castlemaine of my wives bedchamber; and whosoever I finde use any endeavour to hinder this resolution of myne (except it be only to myselfe), I will be his enemy to the last moment of my life. You know what a true friende I have been to you. If you will oblige me eternally, make this business as easy as you can of what opinion soever you are of; for I am resolved to go through with this matter lett what will come on it; which againe I solemnly sweare before Almighty God. Therefore, if you desire to have the continuance of my friendship, meddle no more with this businesse excepte it be to beare down all false and scandalous reports, and to facilitate what I am sure my honour is so much concerned in; and whosoever I finde to be my Lady Castlemaine's enmy in this matter, I do promise upon my word, to be his enmy as long as I live. You may show this letter to my L^d. Lnt., and if you have both a minde to oblige me cary yourselves like friends to me in this matter.

CHARLES R."

If the limits of a review article would allow such a diversion, we should like to notice, if only in brief, the career of that poor queen; how her attendants that had followed her from Portugal were one by one driven from her service; how her sense of wifehood at first revolted at the relations with Lady Castlemaine proposed by her husband, and she was forced to yield to the Chancellor's entreaties which his base servility made him employ;² how

¹ Sir Alan Broderick, Com. of Irish Affairs and M.P. for Dungarvan.

² In his "Account" he writes how with the King he urged "the hard-heartedness and cruelty in laying such a command upon the Queen which flesh and blood could not comply with;" how his course had already "lost him some ground," and how its continuance "would break the hearts of all his friends, and be only grateful to those

her submission, made her no new friends, but lost to her some of her old ; how she was rescued from the criminations of Oates, yet with no more feeling than would have been bestowed upon the lowest woman of England who was known to be guiltless. It might be interesting to follow the Lady Castlemaine, now become Duchess of Cleveland, in her ons and offs with her royal lover, in her persistent and finally successful endeavors to ruin the Lord Chancellor after the sale of Dunkirk and the disasters of a war against the undertaking of which he had striven in vain. But we must make an end with that of the statesman whom we have been considering. He died hard. Beyond measure it surprised and pained him that his servile compliances with things which his judgment and his conscience alike had condemned, had lost for him both the confidence of the people and the friendship of the court. It was pitiful to see how tenaciously he clung to power, even after he must have known that his hold upon it was forever broken, how he resisted every intimation to resign, how anguishingly he received the orders for his disgrace, and how in his exile he was ever praying and hoping for pardon and permission to return. Among the very last letters written by him were those addressed to his daughter and his son-in-law regarding the reports of her conversion to the Roman Catholic faith. In these was shown his accurate knowledge of the temper of the English nation upon this subject. After some discussion of the theological points, he insinuated a caution which, had James been a more politic man, might have been otherwise heeded, that if the reported defection from the English Church were true, "it might very probably raise a greater storm against the Roman Catholics in general than modest men can wish." Even in banishment he seemed to hold to the idea that action in matters of most vital importance should be determined upon with views of personal security. His remonstrances had no effect. His daughter died in the consolations of that faith from which, in the want of maternal guidance, her surviving daughters were destined to become estranged.

There is much pathos in the last appeal made by Clarendon a few months before his death at Rouen. In June (1671) he had written to the King and entreated "that an old man who had

who wished for the destruction of monarchy." Yet in a month after this he writes thus to the Duke of Ormond : " I have likewise twice spoken with the Queene. The Lady hath beene at Courte, and kissed her hande, and returned that night. I cannot tell you ther was no discomposure. I am not out of hope, and that is all I can yett say. I shall send this by Sr All. Brodericke, and so shall not neede to use cypher; but hereafter I shall always use cypher upon this argument, and I believe rarely upon any other; and therefore you must take the paynes still to dischyfer yourselfe."

served the Crown above thirty years in some trust and in some acceptation, might be allowed to end his days in the society of his children," and in the hope that so humble a petition would not be refused, he had begun to give directions for some changes and repairs of his former country estate. No answer being received, he wrote again in August. "Seven years," he said, "was a time prescribed and limited by God himself for the extirpation of some of his greatest judgments; and it is full that time since I have, with all possible humility, sustained the insupportable weight of the King's displeasure. Since it will be in nobody's power long to keep me from dying, methinks the desiring a place to die in should not be thought a great presumption, nor unreasonable for me to beg leave to die in my own country and among my own children." No attention was given this last appeal, and three months afterwards he died in that country in which he had spent so many years in a former exile, and to which he had not even endeavored to save his own from paying dishonorable tribute. To the gratitude which he so humbly prayed to be paid for long, laborious, patient services, many of which had been rendered in pandering to gratifications not only unworthy of a king, but most unmanly and vicious, it must have been anguishing to feel, if he did feel, that he was not entitled. Little affection appears to have been between him and his son-in-law. Probable it is that the latter felt and exhibited contempt for his want of sincerity and courage, qualities that, however they may have been ignored by some historians, this last of the Stuart kings had to a higher degree than any of the rest of that house.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ART.

The History of Christian Art, in the First Eight Centuries of the Church.

By Fr. Raffaele Garrucci, S. J. Illustrating all the Monuments of Painting and Sculpture; with Five Hundred Full Page Plates, Engraved on Brass. In Six Folio Volumes.

SO reads the title-page of the beautiful and valuable work of Fr. Garrucci. Such a work as this, the result of twenty-six years of toil, one does not see often in a century, and it is a reminder that, amid the torrent of quickly written, cheaply sold, and quickly forgotten books, the age of truly great works has not yet passed away. A glance at the author's life and work, and at the circumstances which led to its production, will be of value to thoughtful minds.

A notice of the death of Father Garrucci in the *American Journal of Archæology* says: "He was one of the most learned archæologists of Italy, and especially in the branch of iconography, and devoted himself almost entirely to the study of early Christian art. His numerous writings extend over a period of thirty-five years, and comprise his collections of early Latin inscriptions, his *Vetri Ornati di Figure in Oro* (1858), his monograph on the *Jewish Cemetery of the Via Appia*, and finally his great work, *Storia dell' Arte Christiana nei primi otto secoli della Chiesa* (1872-1882), in which he has illustrated, in six folio volumes of text and plates, every known work produced by the Christian art of the first eight centuries. . . . Shortly before his death he had completed a colossal work, which is soon to be published, on the history of Italian coinage from the origin of the '*aes rude*' down to the present time."

His recent death deprives the world of a learned and unwearied worker, but his name must remain forever linked to the history of Christian art. Fr. Garrucci was born in Naples on January 23d, 1812, entered the Society of Jesus at the age of fourteen in 1826, and at the age of seventy-three, on May 5th, 1885, the very day when his hand had corrected the last page of proof of his colossal work on Numismatics, death put an end to his labors.

His training and gradual development were eminently adapted to the great work to which he devoted his life. After several years spent in teaching literature, and pursuing those studies which started him on his career an able theologian, he applied himself exclusively to the study of sacred and profane antiquities.

He soon became universally esteemed for his erudition and philological acquirements, and especially for his skill in the interpretation of emblems, Hebrew, Egyptian, Phœnician, Etruscan, as well as of those of Greece and Rome.

His experience in paleography and art were such that from partial fragments he was able to restore the inscriptions. Years afterwards, when the missing portions were brought to light, the actual readings verified the approximate ones previously given by Fr. Garrucci. To decide the origin, epoch, or country of a parchment or a monument, a short examination was sufficient, and on such points his judgments were sought for by professional men and accepted as of the highest value.

It was after he had spent twenty years in the study of antiquities, reading and annotating all the Oriental, Greek, and Latin Fathers, and making himself familiar with the museums and collections of art, public and private, throughout Europe, that he felt himself prepared to begin his great work.

Among his earlier productions were the Illustrations of the Lateran Museum; the Graphites or Tracings of Pompeii, of Rome; the Inscriptions of Salerno, Benevento, Pozzuoli, Pietri; the Ancient Geography of Italy, the Museum of Campagna, the Oscan Tongue, the Grammar and Dictionary of its Inscriptions, besides papers on archæology without number, published in various reviews, or read before the different academies of which he was a member.

At present our attention must be limited to the work mentioned above, wherein it may be said in truth that the author has created the theory of Christian art.

The first volume of the work explains the theory in six parts. 1. Art; 2. Man; 3. Symbols; 4. Personification; 5. Types of the Old Testament; 6. Types of the New Testament. The history embraces Christian art in its origin and progress from the first to the eighth century.

The remaining five volumes include the illustrations of many thousands of subjects, together with the explanations and proofs, from various writers, of their symbolic meaning. In the second volume are the paintings from cemeteries; in the third, those from basilicas, codices, sacred ornaments, glass engraved on gold ground, etc.; in the fourth, mosaics; in the fifth, sarcophagi; and in the sixth, designs on gold, silver, bronze, ivory, marble, glass, lead, coins, seals, and precious stones. The trustworthiness of these illustrations may be gathered from the fact that the plates are from copies made by the author from the original monuments in the cases where these monuments were still in existence. To procure the most perfect results no labor or expense has been

spared, and all the resources of modern times, photography, artificial illumination, skilled draughtsmen, have contributed to the reproduction of these monuments.

The first idea of writing the History of Christian Art was conceived in 1856. Fr. Martin, of Paris, the celebrated author of the *Vitraux de Bourges*, was about to publish a translation of Buonarroti's *Vitra Cemeteryalia*, and anxious to have the help of so experienced an archæologist as Fr. Garrucci, invited his aid in the work. Fr. Garrucci called his attention to the fact that, besides the work of Buonarroti, there were many other *Vitra* yet unpublished; moreover, some of the copies of Buonarroti were not exact, others were copies of counterfeits. Why should not Fr. Martin make a complete publication of his own? On reflection, Fr. Martin concluded to examine all existing specimens and to publish only those whose genuineness and accuracy he had tested by personal experience. Soon this first idea was enlarged, and Fr. Garrucci proposed to Fr. Martin his own plan of embracing in their work not only the *glass collections*, but all the monuments of Christian art. The plan was accepted, developed, and matured, and they started out on their career of exploration, examination, and labor together. Both Fr. Martin and Fr. Garrucci were excellent draughtsmen, and with a third experienced hand the work went forward vigorously for three years. In order to copy specimens, it was often necessary to erect scaffoldings at great danger and enormous expense, and during one of the most daring of these enterprises, while copying a mosaic from the ceiling of a cupola at Ravenna, sudden death seized upon Fr. Martin, and Fr. Garrucci was left to carry on the tremendous work alone.

After fifteen years spent in writing, and in gathering these monuments, and preparing his theory, Fr. Garrucci began the publication of his work in 1872. In 1882 it was completed. Ten years may seem a long time for the publication of a single work, but when we consider that in five of the folio volumes every second page is a full page engraving, some containing three, ten, or twenty different figures, the wonder ceases.

Besides the Christian monuments, Fr. Garrucci has given an ample collection of the monuments of the Jews and of non-Catholic art in two separate treatises. An appendix treats of monuments counterfeited by famous impostors. The cemeteries whose paintings are given in the History of Christian Art are the following: all the cemeteries of Rome and Naples; a cemetery of Syracuse, Milan, Rheims, Alexandria in Egypt, Cyrene, and Cyrenic Lybia.

We shall now pass to the examination of the nature of Christian art itself. Art, as such, and Christian art are two different things. A fine art, it is said, aims at the representation of the beautiful.

But Christian art cannot stop here, and rest in the mere representation of what may please the eye. It is inseparable from intellectual and moral good. It lives in a sphere above the sensual, and while it does not reject the materially beautiful, this last must be altogether subordinate to the intellectual and moral good to be derived from the work, as well as to the special end which Christian art has in view. This end is to bring before the mind of man the dogmas and teachings of the Church, as well by the avenues of vision as by those of hearing, through which, says St. Paul, "Faith cometh." Outline, form, color, must all be subject to this end.

Christian art does not mean merely the work of a Christian. Artistic results produced by a brush in the hands of a Christian can no more be styled Christian art, than the "Imitation of Christ" printed by a Protestant, could be called a Protestant book. Christian art means the use of the art of design to teach Catholic dogma, or to suggest the mysteries of the Catholic religion. For Christian art, in the early centuries, was Catholic art, and to-day there can be no true Christian art which is not, at the same time, Catholic art. In the early Christian art of the Church, the elements of form, color, outline, were employed only in so far as they were a mode of conveying the meaning of some mystery or truth of religion, whereas, in modern art, a widely existing complaint is that in many paintings where outline, form, and color are next to faultless, the work itself is devoid of spiritual or intellectual meaning, and too often is utterly innocent of any meaning at all.

It is worth our while here to examine briefly the ideas of our illustrious author on the nature of Christian art. Man may communicate his ideas by means of signs or images impressed on matter. Thus, for instance, alphabetic writing transmits ideas without representing them. Whereas, the art of painting not only transmits the idea, but represents it; and if this is done according to certain rules we call it art. Therefore, the art of design, or painting, is the faculty of communicating ideas by means of images drawn or painted according to fixed rules.

This communication is made by a human act, and, consequently, is inseparable from moral good or evil, according as the idea is or is not conformed to intellectual truth and moral good.

What do we mean by beautiful? Beautiful is the name given to a work of art that represents, truthfully, a concept of the mind and is pleasing to the senses. The *ideal* of the beautiful, or the æsthetically beautiful, cannot be limited to the materiality of the image. For that cannot be called wholly beautiful which is at variance with truth, even though it have in the highest degree all the perfection that can please the senses.

The end aimed at by Pagan society in its art was to represent the most perfect beauty, in the proportion of limbs and in the grace of attitude, portrayed to express the passions of the soul. But that which could appear beautiful to their pagan eyes, cannot appear so to ours, for whom the ideal of the beautiful must be, as a first requisite, intellectual and moral. The end of the Church, in her art, could not be merely to please the eye by sensible beauty, or to arouse animal passion, which naturally tends to what the eye represents as suited to its appetite. She ordained art to a most noble end, one in harmony with her divine institution, the constant and vivid remembrance of revealed truth, and the stirring of the will to reach that last end proposed to conscious intelligence. By means of visible pictures she calls to mind the reality of the invisible world, and strives to keep its image ever before the windows of the soul.

To seek only the æsthetics of the human form in Christian art, would be as far out of place as to look for the same in Egyptian hieroglyphics, which were intended to express not beautiful and perfect figures, but a meaning, through the use of action and signs. Art, at times, forgot the reason of its being.

For must it not be conceded that at the *Renaissance* art became, in a certain sense, Pagan? In general, little was appreciated or sought for save beauty and grace of design; and in the exhibition of this, but small heed was given to what was becoming or to the reverence due religion. And the beholders, in consequence, far from being reminded of holy mysteries, were moved to idle thoughts, to speak of nothing worse.

For this reason, we see the want of logic in those who blame the early Church because she does not seek material perfection in her pictures and sculpture. Her end was not to please men's senses, but to save men's souls. Neither can one with any justice impute to her influence the decadence of art, for in the fourth century, even for material perfection, her pictures are a marvel of artistic beauty.

It is not to be thought, however, that Christian pictures or sculpture should not be as perfect as possible; that would be a mistake. The beauty of God's universe is for the children of God. But this perfection ought to be subordinate to the higher end which the Church, in her paintings, has in view.

For her noble end she made use of Christian artists as she found them; some were good, others only mediocre, some had to be trained anew. To these she taught Christian art—that is, the art which portrayed the religion taught by Jesus Christ Our Lord, thus planting holy thoughts in the mind, and in the heart the chaste love of eternal life. As to herself, history is witness of her respect for what was good in the monuments of Pagan art.

With this brief outline of the great principle underlying Christian art, we must pass to the illustrations that clothed this principle with life and shape. To recognize the positive value of the Christian sculptures of the Catacombs in their bearing upon religion, it should be remembered, furthermore, that these artists were under the systematic direction of the theologians of the Church, and what they depicted was nothing less than the expression in pictures and the symbolizing of the dogma of Catholic theology. And while to the Catholic mind, then, it conveyed the mysteries of faith as it does now, most plainly and vividly, to the mind of the pagan, from whom it was intended to conceal precisely that signification, it was but a meaningless grouping of signs and objects. In these scripturally theological writings, we find arguments for the belief, for instance, of the real presence in the Blessed Eucharist, in the first ages of the Church, so undeniable and convincing that were other testimonies to perish, a proof sufficient for any reasonable mind would here survive.

What were the subjects of these pictures? In the beginning they were a simple portrayal of some event of the Old Testament. Afterwards, combinations were made of various events that had relations one with the other, thus forming a connected and significant group or series. Then was devised a method of picturing occurrences, which may be called, not inaptly, the *Perspective of Faith*, wherein one scriptural event opens the vision of the mind to other events farther on in the landscape of Time. It was a way of representing a prophecy through the medium of art, and has received the name of *compenetration*.

This effect was produced by the following novel and interesting method. In a picture which represented a prophetic action, was placed not the person who performed that action, but the one who was prefigured in it. We shall make this clear by an example: In the place of Moses striking the rock, a figure of Christ Our Lord is represented in the same attitude.

Thus a picture was given, not of the real event, but of the figurative meaning of it, so that the personage or position represented by the artist became for the spectator the hieroglyphic key to determine the event to which the prophecy referred.

This secret of the meaning of Christian art, in some of its phases, before Fr. Garrucci's interpretation and systematic development, had been either only partly conjectured, or altogether unknown. By him the sculptures have been so coördinated and explained, and their meaning proved, that on this point his work has been acknowledged of the greatest value, and he is esteemed as the creator of the theory of Christian Art.

The researches of the illustrious Commendatore de Rossi, so well

known and so often alluded to by Fr. Garrucci, were chiefly directed to the architecture and inscriptions of the Catacombs; those of Fr. Garrucci were devoted almost exclusively to the sculptures and paintings. The work of both was based upon the same grand monuments, both were colossal and magnificent, and each has its own special merit and glory. In support of his general theory, Fr. Garrucci brings forward many testimonies of the Fathers of the Church, and for the interpretation of particular pictures he has made it evident by citations that the painter's object was to translate into images the symbolism contained in a page of the Fathers. He proves most conclusively that the sculptures are not, as some have asserted, but not proved, the result of the pious and unguided devotion of the early Christians. To explain this theory we shall make use of examples. These place before the mind more truly the meaning to be conveyed. To illustrate the fundamental principle, namely, that besides the scriptural event, the pictures represented the prophetic meaning, three examples may be chosen.

The first is a representation of Daniel taken from the entrance of the cemetery of Domitilla (Garrucci, *Hist. d. a. c.*, Plate 19, No. 1). Daniel is represented standing on a rock towards which two lions are approaching. His hands are extended in prayer. In this picture he is neither nude nor clothed in the Persian costume, for in both these ways he is represented in other pictures, but his garment is a short tunic fastened at the waist by a belt. Now many of these circumstances are quite at variance with the history of Daniel as we read it in the sacred scriptures, and especially that of placing him on an eminence instead of in the den of lions, as he is elsewhere represented. One unacquainted with the theory of Fr. Garrucci might cry out on beholding this picture, "Look at the ignorance, or at least the caprice, of the artist of the early Christians." He represents Daniel on a mountain surrounded by lions, when we know the place into which he was cast was deep, "for the accusers of Daniel did not reach the bottom of the den before the lions caught them and broke all their bones in pieces." But can we suppose that artists so experienced as these designers show themselves to be, were ignorant of so characteristic a point, and of a personage so well known? Or shall we imagine that the sacred ministers who presided over these early works of the Church failed to instruct them aright on such a point? It is more reasonable to judge that there is some strange secret meaning, to indicate which so notable an alteration has taken place in subjects so familiar.

From the writings of the Fathers, we know that Daniel condemned to the lions was a figure of Christ in His passion. To make this prophetic sense more apparent, Daniel is represented not in the den of lions, but on a hill, that of Calvary, and clothed,

furthermore, in the shepherd's tunic, as the Good Shepherd that "giveth His life for His sheep."

The second illustration may be taken from the bas-relief of a sarcophagus of Toulouse (Plate 319), which represents the sacrifice of Abraham. Abraham is in the act of sacrificing his son Isaac, who has his hands tied behind his back. Thus far the picture is faithful to the scripture narrative. But we notice other personages present, and this is contrary to the sacred text, which states explicitly that Abraham said to two young men with him: "Stay you here with the ass; I and the boy will go with speed as far as yonder, and after we have worshipped will return to you." (Gen. xxii., 5). Nevertheless, in this representation Abraham is surrounded by several persons, and among them a veiled woman stands at his right, and a young man near him to whom he speaks. This person is again represented in the attitude of beckoning to others who follow.

This variation seems to be against truth and propriety, for besides the divergence from the biblical text, it seems difficult to conjecture any suitable meaning. But by recalling to mind that the sacrifice of Isaac was a prophetic figure of the sacrifice of the cross, a meaning which the painter wished to make as vivid and actual as possible, every detail in this scene has its special significance. By that sacrifice was to be established the new covenant and the new Church, and hence we understand why that Church figured by the woman, together with her spouse, Christ, and the Apostles, are represented as present at the sacrifice.

The person speaking to Abraham represents Christ Our Lord, instead of the Angel who pointed out to Abraham the Lamb to be sacrificed in place of Isaac. The figure in the attitude of beckoning represents the vocation of the Gentiles, referring to the Redeemer promised to *Abram* at the time when his name was changed and he was called the Father of Nations, *Abraham*.

Our third illustration will be a brief reference to the Wedding at Cana so often represented on *Christian glass* (Plates 169, 1-7; 170, 1; 187, 1), where we constantly see seven jars depicted, when the Evangelist mentions only six. This variation is introduced to represent the fulness of grace signified by the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, obtained chiefly through the Blessed Eucharist, of which the changing of water into wine was a figure.

Thus we see that the subjects were taken from the New as well as from the Old Testament, and conveyed the same dogmatic or moral meaning as was taught by the Fathers of the Church.

Our author calls particular attention to one example of a glass jar in the celebrated Kircher Museum. It is the design of a fish on a gourd. What could such a combination signify without re-

course to the mystical meaning to explain the union? The prophet Jonas is so frequently represented reclining under the gourd vine that the gourd is taken as a symbol of the prophet. Now Jonas was three days in the whale's belly, and Christ was to be three days in the tomb. Hence, the gourd, the symbol of Jonas, and the fish, the symbol of Christ, are, in combination, a symbol of Christ's resurrection.

But here we must pause, for were we to mention but a fraction of the interesting subjects before us, our little explanation would swell to a volume. We cannot, however, omit one or two of the other curious and interesting modes of recalling the truths of religion by means of Christian art.

At times in these sacred sculptures there are united in one group actions which belong to different times, places, or persons. This method, as was noted above, has been called *compenetration*. There are chiefly two classes; the first refers to the prophetic sense when, as we have seen in the example of Moses, into the *fact* of the prophecy is introduced the *person* of the fulfilment. The second method of compenetration, also in use in profane art, and called the synthetic method, consists in uniting, in a single scene, the successive actions of the same persons. One of this class is the frequently repeated group of Adam and Eve, in which case we observe the combination of the successive events narrated in Genesis. In this one group we see the serpent twisted about the tree speaking to Eve; at the same time she holds the apple in her hand, while, on the other hand, Adam is making a gesture of deprecation and accusing the woman, and both are covered with leaves. Thus four successive actions are represented as one.

But not only do we find the coördination of events closely succeeding each other, but we see in these pictures the coördination of events that were separated by great intervals of time. On a beautiful sarcophagus of the Lateran (Plate 350) is a sculptured design divided into four parts. Each division makes up a complete subject, yet forming, with the other pictures, a continuous whole.

In the first section we behold the creation of man, and then our first parents fallen from grace, but consoled by the promise of a Redeemer. This is symbolized by Our Saviour, who carries in His arms a lamb and a sheaf of wheat. The first, a symbol of the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross, the second, a symbol of the unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar.

The second square shows the fulfilment of the prophecy of a Redeemer. The woman who was to crush the head of the serpent is represented together with her Divine Son. Fallen man, recognizing his Redeemer, is figured by the Magi, and the nations receiving the faith are symbolized by the cure of the man born blind.

The subject of the third picture is the manifestation by Christ of His Divine Mission by His miracles ; His first one at Cana, His last one at Bethany, and the third one in the desert. These three are not chosen by chance. There was the evident purpose of representing the chief dogmas of Our Faith. In Cana and the desert we behold the Eucharist as sacrifice and sacrament; and in the raising of Lazarus, Our Lord's own resurrection.

The fourth portion in these pictures refers to three subjects concerning St. Peter, whose supremacy in the Church is the vital dogma of Christianity. This was most especially inculcated in that age to which the monument is referred, because of the heresy of the Donatists, who claimed to be the true Church of Christ. In the centre of this group of four pictures is one that may be called the Epilogue, as Fr. Garrucci terms it. It is Daniel in the lion's den, for this was a symbol both of the passion and of the resurrection of Christ, and of the Christian. For he, strengthened by the Eucharist, figured by the bread which Daniel received from Habacuc, hopes by the merits of the passion of Christ for the rewards of the resurrection. Is not this a sublime discourse? To it the author gives the name of Homily in Christian art. From these we learn the identity of our belief with that of the first ages, an argument for the Unity of the Church in her rites and her doctrines, even as the centuries roll on. And when the last wave of Time, striking upon the shores of Eternity, breaks and floats away, carrying with it into oblivion the sects and theories which deluded men have sought to substitute for her divine teaching—that wave will leave the Church of Christ, in the unchanging light of Eternity, standing upon the rock whereon He built her, the same as she stood in the Catacombs in the first century of her history. Numerous and magnificent as are the engravings in the work of Fr. Garrucci, its worth does not stop there. The first volume is devoted wholly to the developing and demonstrating of the different points of the theory of Christian art, and each point is supported by constant reference to the testimony of the monuments illustrated in the other five volumes. But this is only part of the work ; and, although it may be the most delightful part of it, assuredly it is not the one which has cost the author the most labor. The treasures of Fr. Garrucci's erudition, skill and teaching are found in the learned explanations which accompany each plate. Here he gives the history of each monument, the proof of its authenticity, the correction of the errors in any previous publication of it. Besides the interpretation of the picture, its prophetic or mystical meaning, we find references to the texts and teaching of the Fathers, and deductions made from these mystical meanings.

In conclusion, few words are needed to say what a magnificent

treasure lies in these volumes, for the art-student, the archæologist, the historian, the curious inquirer as to the belief of the Primitive Church, and to the theologian. But apart from their value to these, it is not easy to over-estimate their usefulness to those who would wish to examine the costumes and customs of the early days of Christianity. There we find described and depicted the garments worn at the different periods. The exterior and interior robe, the Phœnician dalmatic, the chasuble, and the open and sleeveless tunic, the toga and the pallium. How interesting for the casual reader to note that the altar vestment worn by the priest in those days differed but little from the costume of daily life, and how, as the fashions of worldly life changed, the Church in her rites, as in harmony with her doctrines, remained unchanged, so that the chasuble of a priest at the altar to-day is but a slight variation from the civil garb worn by men in the early ages of the Church.

When Our Lord, instructing his disciples in the spirit of the missionary's life, sent them out on their career of Apostolic labor, He told them not to take two tunics. As an example of the fact that but one was worn, it is related of St. John that when he gave his tunic to a certain Aristodemus, he had no other tunic, but remained wrapped in his outer garment or pallium.

There we learn how ancient is the custom of cutting the beard and hair: "*Clericus nec comam nutriat nec barbam*" (398 A.D., Conc. Carth. iv., Can. 44); and whatever the meaning of these words, in many of the paintings the men are represented with smooth faces.

Again, how much light is here thrown upon various expressions in Scripture otherwise barely intelligible, the gestures in prayer, the lifting of hands, the embracing of the feet and knees in sign of adoration or supplication, as when Mary at the Resurrection threw herself at Our Lord's feet, or at Bethany sat in silence there while Martha "was busied about many things." What a source of unfailing delight to turn these beautifully engraved pages, so beautiful in their simplicity, so sublime in the mysterious meanings therein signified, so filled with wonder and interest when one has the key to open up the hidden meanings of Faith. There is about it that exquisite charm for the human mind awakened on meeting some unknown problem of nature, a problem the more interesting from the fact that one has in his power a clue to solve the mystery.

Perhaps these magnificent volumes, this monument of art, this storehouse of history and masterpiece in the annals of archæology, may be inaccessible to our American students. It is to be hoped, however, that this want will be supplied, that a work so valuable

in itself and so replete with interest from so many points of view, will not be reserved to visitors of European libraries alone. The perfection of the plates, their number, elegance, and the skill of execution, make the work a marvel in the art of engraving. Let it be hoped, then, that in all our libraries, or at least in those that pretend to completeness in valuable books, and especially those which take a just pride in their art collections, this work, the basis of Christian Art, will find its place for the instruction and the admiration of all who are interested in religion, art, archæology, and history, and especially in the religion and art history of the earlier days of the Christian World.

IS THE CHURCH GAINING OR LOSING GROUND IN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES?

IT is necessary that we first explain the question, What do we mean by the words "gaining" and "losing"? It is obvious that the Church may gain or lose ground in three senses which are perfectly distinct: first, as to the number of professing Catholics; secondly, as to the force of religion in the national life; thirdly, as to the collective influence of clergy and laity over the civil or political powers of the country. That these three senses are distinct, and may even sometimes be at issue, is made apparent by what we see around us every day. The number of professing Catholics in any country does not indicate the national earnestness or the national sloth. In France there are thousands of persons professing Catholicity who do not trouble themselves with its duties or its obligations. So that our second sense, "the force of religion in the national life," is not commensurate with the numerical force of professing Catholics. And as to our third sense, how is it possible that any Catholic community should have "collective influence over the institutions of the country," if the fashion of the age is to "take religion very easily," or to divorce it from all overt acts of the public life?

A good deal of misapprehension must be necessarily engendered by the political attitude of a (Catholic) government towards the Church. Politics, in their bearing on Catholic vitality, are very intricate and delicate matters for Catholic critics. Theoretically, the general principles of political justice are subjected, and must

always be so, to the Supreme Authority ; while, practically, the actual noise of political systems somewhat deafens the popular sense as to their true merits. People are so apt to decry a system as being hostile to the spirit of the Catholic Church, when it is not the system, but the governing minds who administer it, who are responsible for a very painful antagonism. The French Republic, like the ardent Absolutism of Louis XIV., has been very heartily abused by some Catholic critics. Yet has Absolutism or Republicanism been more offensive? Was an absolutism which *used* religion as its political handmaid—while doing nothing for the practical advance of pure religion—less pernicious than is a republic which sets religion quite aside, or even persecutes its priests or professors? The question is worth asking ; because some people think “The Republic” to be the mother of all impiety in modern France. Is it a whit more so than was the religious Cæsarism of Louis XIV., who, while affecting to be the eldest son of the Church, set an example, at Versailles, which was not edifying? Is it not better to have a government which is not Catholic, or which is even anti-Catholic in its temper (and which, therefore, avoids the scandal of hypocrisy), than to have a government which so combines religion with the world that the latter is the senior partner and the director? Is it not better for the clergy, and better for the laity, and better, also, for the outside countries which are looking on? To sail under our own flag is at least ingenuous ; and, as to persecution, it does not matter one straw. Persecution is a high wind which freshens the heart ; while hypocrisy is a sultry mist which sickens the soul. Open warfare is much better than sham peace. Louis XIV. did more harm to religion than does M. Constans or M. Paul Bert. We know what we are about with a professed enemy. But a Catholic Cæsarism, which only *used* the Catholic religion, was a despotism at once spiritual and political.

It is strange that non-Catholics have been, as a rule, the stoutest defenders of what is called “the divine right of kings.” Indeed, Cæsarism is modern ; it is not Catholic. The Emperor of all the Russias (like two of the Stuarts of England, and also like Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth) is supreme autocrat of souls as well as of bodies. There is, of course, a reason why this should be so. If a potentate claims to be a pontiff, he may consistently demand and receive reverence. “I am to you in the place of the Pope,” says Alexander III. to his subjects ; and so said Queen Elizabeth and Henry VIII. But no Catholic sovereign can say this. For above the Catholic sovereign is the Supreme Pontiff, to whom he, like his subjects, is submissive. Now, if we consider what must be the effect on a Catholic nation of the attitude of its government

towards religion, we easily apprehend that the aspects of that attitude may be to them (and to us) very delusive. A people is apt to be judged by its government; or is supposed to create the tone of its government. This really is not true in Catholic countries. That France is republican is an accident of past mistakes; that the Republic is a mixed quantity,—half Catholic, half infidel,—is an accident of the political circumstances of the times. That the French republic *might be* wholly Catholic, and *might be* the most desirable government for the French, we can easily believe, if only the Catholics of France were as earnest about politics as about religion. But they are not so. French Catholics are not much busied with politics. That is to say, they feel an interest in politics; but prefer the quiet of their religion to demonstration. The free-thinkers are the real political agitators. And once in power, they have a bad trick of persecuting the very Catholics who have lifted them up to their position. But the Catholics are very reposeful in their politics. They talk of them in their homes, and among their friends, but they do not hurry into the arena of political combat. They deplore every government attack upon religion, but they do not rush to take up arms against the aggressors. They read, with an impassioned interest, every Catholic journal or brochure which takes the side of the Catholic faith against the free-thinkers; yet they stop short at such honest literary enthusiasm, and rather hope than struggle manfully for better days. This characteristic of the vast majority of “good” French Catholics produces, necessarily, a wrong impression on the outer world. American, English, Irish Protestants naturally jump at the easy inference that a Catholic nation which patiently *suffers* an un-Catholic government cannot be really Catholic at heart. Hence the assumption (which we see expressed in Protestant newspapers) that “the Catholic Church is losing ground in Catholic France.” Political *power* it is quite certain that the Church has lost; a Catholic *government* it is quite certain France has lost; yet if we compare the France of to-day with the France of Louis XIV., she is more Catholic to-day than she was then. Leaving out of the reckoning the peasantry of France, who have always been what they are now, intensely Catholic, the upper classes and the upper middle-classes are higher-toned Catholics to-day than they were when vulgar Cæsarism *used* the Church. The bishops are higher-toned, because they rebuke an *infidel* government, instead of shutting their eyes and ears to an *immoral* government. The aristocrats are higher-toned, because they keep their religion and their politics two distinct, and not two impossibly-mixed classes. The business classes are higher-toned, because they have their principles differentiated, and know exactly which is the Church, which the devil. In the old Versailles

days, the world, the flesh and the devil were all in active fraternity with the show of Faith. This was rotten. We may hail the present antagonism in the French nation, between religion and the *de facto* governing authorities, as a healthy and manly substitute for that most detestable of all hypocrisies—the *using* of the Catholic faith as a political bulwark.

While speaking of France, we must remember, also, that its literature has to be taken account of quite as much as its Government. Yet, whether we take the Catholic literature or the infidel literature of to-day, there is nothing in either to make us conclude, with despondency, that the Catholic Church has lost ground in Catholic France. The French Catholic literature, solely in the sense of Catholic journalism, is abundant in bravery as in circulation. No one expects that what are popularly known as “religious papers” can equal in number the “all round” papers of the same country; because the “all round” papers generally *include* religious news, while religious papers generally *exclude* secular news: Yet, of the 1568 Parisian journals, and the 2506 provincial journals, the vast majority are most respectful towards religion; the small minority are equally blatant and atheistic. And this is a healthy sign: that religion and irreligion have their separate and openly hostile literary camps; trimming or hypocrisy being no weakness of the French character, as it is of the English journalistic leading-article character! Indeed, in all Catholic countries there is this thoroughly wholesome trait: that the two camps, the two standards, have their flags. They nail their flags to the mast, and do not give their left hand to the enemy while giving their right hand to those who “increase their circulation.” The English Protestant press is chameleon in its religiosity; so that while advocating Christian virtues in rounded periods, it pats the Pagan Mr. Herbert Spencer on the back, or approves the “daring honesty” of Mr. Bradlaugh. To find out the religious principles of the *Times* newspaper,—or, for that matter, of the *Daily Telegraph* or the *Daily News*, or even of the so-called religious English newspapers, would tax the powers of the most subtle analyst of human writings, because the affirmations are mostly constructed out of the negatives. But it is not so with the French journalists or French essayists. If they are skeptical, they do not pretend to be pious; if they are infidel, they do not pretend to be Christian.

An American or English Protestant will argue plausibly: “The French nation is quite obviously infidel, because so many of its journalists profess impiety.” These reasoners ignore the fact that French writers *say* what they are, whereas a leading article writer in the weathercock London *Times* writes *outside* himself or his own opinions. He poses in a fictitious attitude of superiority,

intended to impose on all believers and all unbelievers. A few weeks ago a *Times* leader writer informed his readers that the Roman Jesuits had designed to poison Leo XIII. unless he conceded liberties to their Society, which concessions he had been prudent enough to make. "If we are unwilling to credit the current report at Rome," wrote this sapient gentleman (possibly smiling), "it is not because it reflects on the Jesuits, but rather because it reflects on the Pope." So that the playful gossip of a few Italians, indulged in as a good joke, is set down as a "current report," which it was not, and the whole body of Italian Jesuits are branded as poisoners, at least in their moral bent or disposition. After this statement of fact came the sublime Christian reflection that "the morality of the Italians, *imperfect as it is* [English morality is well known to be typical, especially in Printing House Square], is indebted largely to Catholic teaching and supervision." Now this sort of balderdash is exceptionally Protestant. French infidel journalists would not stoop to it. To hit with the right hand and caress with the left hand is an odd state of the affections, but it is not French. "The most unscrupulous Society in the world," says the *Times* writer, meaning, of course, the Society of Jesus, "is stated to be obnoxious to the public conscience [we had always imagined that a conscience was purely private and that no two people could go halves in the same conscience] because it contemplates the horrible actuality of the world finally escaping from the control of the Church," which control, as the same writer assures us, "is the *only* moral control which remains over millions of Italians." Such twaddle as this is exceptionally Protestant. No French journalist would sign his name to it. And it is because the French journalists are outspoken, are at least manly, instead of rounding nonsensical periods to please all Protestants, that superficial non-Catholics in America and in England put an utterly wrong construction on their blatancy. The old French philosophers, like the rabid Voltaire, kept outside the sickly assumption of moralizing, and, while snorting and neighing against Catholicity, never appropriated infallible morals to themselves. The Protestant mind is deeply grieved at the "imperfect morality" of the Italians, which it seeks to mend by imbecile falsehoods about the Jesuits. Protestantism is too unreal to be judicial. Nor can the Protestant mind draw just conclusions as to the "gaining or losing ground" of the Catholic Church in any (recognized) Catholic country, because it does not know the difference between Catholic affirmatives and negatives, between postulates and opinions in the Catholic sense.

To speak of Italy: It can hardly be viewed like other countries, because of the exceptional irritation of "the Roman question."

Rome was seized fourteen years ago by a *coup de main* of outsiders, and at once became, and has always remained, a seat of war. Politics, not religion, governs Rome. "United Italy" takes for its postulate, "we must keep Rome;" and that postulate necessarily involves ousting the Pope. What then? Has the Catholic Church lost ground in the Papal States—or throughout Italy—by the accident of the Pope losing his temporal power? The Catholic Church may have been grievously weakened in what is understood by "the Executive;" its bishops and clergy may have been wounded, *through* their Pontiff, in the dignity or independence of their Order; yet, after all, what is all this but persecution, and when did persecution harm Catholics? Such material warfare as that levelled against the Propaganda is, of course, a material injury to "the Executive," just as the seizing of the material property of monks or nuns, or the confiscation of ecclesiastical sources of revenue, is at once extremely barbarous and extremely insolent; yet what we understand by the Catholic Church "losing ground" is not her suffering from that antagonism which was always her lot and always must be (for how is it possible that the Catholic Church can be unlike her Lord?), it is the actual loss of Catholic souls—of those souls who have lost the faith, or of those souls who ought to have been, but who have been prevented being, Catholic. This seems to be the only just acceptation of such an expression as "losing ground" in regard to the Church. That the Italians acted wickedly in seizing the States of the Church, and that they have acted wickedly in confiscating Church property, "goes without saying" in the Catholic conscience. Yet, after all, it was *only* persecution. And as to affirming that the Catholic Church can "lose ground" by being persecuted, we should be affirming a flat denial of a Catholic principle. The Protestant fanatics, of course, shouted, "The Pope has fallen!" when, for about the fiftieth time, brigandage got the better of him; precisely in the same spirit in which unbelievers in the time of Christ made His humiliation a subject for triumphant mockery; but the whole interpretation of persecution by the Catholic mind is that it is a "gain," not a "loss," to the Catholic Church. Such a reflection seems unavoidable when considering the question: "Has the Catholic Church lost ground in Catholic Italy?" The answer is, and most emphatically, it has not. Numerically, there are as many Catholics—professing Catholics—as there were before the Garibaldian aggression; and, as to the force of the Catholic religion in the Italian life, it is as keen as it was before the persecution.

It must be remembered that there are two Italys, just as there are two Frances. The Catholic camp and the United Italy camp are in hostility in Italy; especially are they in hostility in Rome.

It is allowed by even the Italianissimi that not one-tenth part of Italians had any voice in the "returns" of the present Parliament, and that the nine-tenths, if they spoke their real mind, would be in favor of the restoration of the Papal power. The "Abstentionists" in Italy, like the same class in France, represent the national will or political sentiment. Difficult as it is to get at numbers where "abstention" is the principal factor in the arithmetic, few of the most ardent Italianissimi would deny to you (if you engaged them in a private conversation) that the Papal party is an *imperium in imperio*, and that the Papal *imperium* is the "national" one. Great as is the force of the Masonic hierarchy and of that "possession which is nine points of the law," they who know what was the machinery of the usurpation, and what is the machinery of the occupation, estimate the "logic of facts" at its true value. Now, under the flag of the Italianissimi are ranged the least Catholic forces—as well as the most anti-Catholic forces—of United Italy, while under the flag of the "Papal party" are ranged those forces which are at least primarily, if not ardently or even exclusively, Catholic. In other words, the Italian nation is Catholic; nor has the Church lost one inch of ground in a religious sense. The elements of the Italian life which are *now* anti-Catholic are the elements which *would* have been so under any circumstances.

That France is now Republican and that Italy is in an unsettled state are facts which, in combination, make the two nations, politically, to look somewhat uneasily at one another. Most of the Italian anti-Papal party would prefer to have an Italian republic, and they have a fear lest the restoration of the French monarchy might tell heavily against their anti-Papal "next move." The anti-Catholic party in France would prefer anything to a restoration, because of its (probable) Catholic tendencies in France and Italy. And so the purely political atmosphere is darkly clouded in both countries by the anti-Catholic hopes and struggles of the governing bodies. Such reflections are quite sufficient to indicate the grave difficulty of judging accurately as to the relative strength of "religious parties."

The French Government, having occupied itself assiduously (during the whole period of the establishing of the New Italy) in worrying bishops, priests and all religious, in bringing up a generation of godless children, and in casting away all holy images from official courts, in "whittling the Concordat" (as a Frenchman put it), and in cutting down the stipends of ecclesiastics, is necessarily in closest sympathy with an anti-Papal Italian Government, and with all Italians who prefer overthrow to legitimacy. The Italianissimi, having emptied the convents, and filled the gaols as the best means of striking a balance, are dear to those French-

men who think the Catechism of M. Defuissieux a fine piece of dogmatic theology for their schools. But what has all this to do with the real loss or the real gain of Catholic ground in Catholic France and Catholic Italy, except so far as it serves to indicate the utter shallowness of hastily concluding that there *has been* a real loss or a real gain? We might as well conclude, when the clouds are thick and murky, or when snow or hail peppers our eyes in the winter, that the sky is no longer blue above the storm, as conclude that the political noise of socialist-democrats disturbs the placid faith of a Catholic people. Such an inference would be quite the reverse of what is true. In everyday life there are scores of instances of what we call "distractions" from our serenity; yet, these we take as natural, or as probationary. And such are the political noises, or "distractions," in the daily, in the centuried, life of the Catholic Church.

Mark, too, one immense gain in all times of persecution: "The purifying of the character of the clergy." By "character" we mean their class-distinctiveness; their recognized official place and superiority. It stands to reason that, in times of ease, when court, palace, and even counting-house, are thrown open, as a matter of course, to the Catholic clergy,—when there is no rupture between the world and religion,—the clergy, being but human, will grow languid in their apostleship, will not feel the necessity of being heroic. This was, certainly, the case in France, in the pre-Revolution period, when monarchy had come to *patronize* bishops and priests. Bishops and priests—that is, some of them, some who moved about the court—grew into the habit of submitting to be patronized, and hence they weakened that national respect which, had it been what it is now, might have mollified the outbreak of the Revolution. People know what the world is; and people know what religion is; and they hate to see the two wearing the same clothes. And it was one of the fruits of that apparent alliance between the court and some Catholic dignitaries (an apparent alliance which, at least, prevented more than one bishop from openly rebuking court-worldliness and immorality) that "the people" lost their honor for the "superior clergy;" and that even the "inferior clergy" got the credit of being courtiers. It must be remembered that no atmosphere could be more corrupting than that of the Court of the so-called Grand Monarque. Royalism had reached a point when the imbecility of rank-worship simply unmanned the strongest wills and stoutest hearts. It was the climax before the utterly abysmal fall. "Was the French Revolution more injurious in its moral tendencies than the age of aristocratic worldliness which preceded it?" was a question which was recently given in an examination-paper in the Grands Semi-

naires of France. As a matter of opinion, it may be hazarded that almost anything is preferable to a haughty patronage of the dignitaries of the Church, by a court which plays fast and loose with Catholic interests, while playing loose only in its moral example. This allusion may suffice to show that the Catholic Church may "lose ground" under the outward profession of the Catholic faith *plus* worldliness; while it helps us to understand that the Catholic faith may "gain ground" under the winnowing influences of persecution. The French clergy of to-day are the very salt of the earth; and the same truth holds good of most Catholic clergy, in all countries which are commonly called Catholic. The reason is that the world is doing them the greatest possible service in bringing all their finest qualities into full play. While imagining that to cut down their stipends, or to fine them for breaking some wicked law, is to lower their dignity or their influence, the anti-Catholic powers are really exalting the Catholic hierarchy into the very position which is the most teaching, the most commanding. Cardinal Guibert was profoundly respected by *all* Frenchmen, because he kept the Church's enemies in their right place. The world is not a fool, if it be worldly; nor does it fail to honor consistency, if it dislike it. The Church has gained ground in the last dozen years, in the sense that all Frenchmen know perfectly what it *means*. And the same truth holds good in regard to Italy. Better far is a persecution-created distinctness than a serenity-created muddle of indifferentism.

Yet, let us be just to non-Catholics, and admit that they have apology for (*primâ facie*) suspecting a weakening of the old foundations. It may be hazarded that there are five (new) reasons in chief why the Church might *seem* to be losing ground in Catholic countries; that is, might seem so to the non-Catholic:

(1.) The growth of a Free Press, in almost all civilized countries, has led to everybody reading and talking everything, with but a superficial apprehension about anything. The use of the rake,—not of the spade,—with most of the students of modern journalism, has engendered a spirit which finds its outlet in an airy or jaunty chatter about the most difficult and mysterious of soul-problems; so that this perpetual chatter gives the impression to the ordinary observer, that divine faith has tumbled down into human opinion.

(2.) Freethinking has become aggressive, instead of being shy or apologetic; pushing its warfare into the inmost camps of Christianity, and trusting to its new Agnosticism to upset the facts of the Old Testament, or to trace a natural evolution in Christianity. This aggressiveness, from the very loftiness of what it attacks, is assumed, by easy thinkers, to promise victory.

(3.) The State-insistence on civil marriage and on godless schools looks like a gain of gross secularism over the Church.

(4.) The increase of democracy *plus* a Socialism which is not Christian, is taken to be a successful protest against Divine Authority; for, though the Catholic Church has never condemned any kind or form of government,—not even a Christian kind of Socialism,—it has always insisted on obedience to authority, and such obedience is, in these days, made light of.

(5.) The very difficulty of deciding positively what *is* a Catholic country makes it easy for the non-Catholic to find apologies. “Is France a Catholic country?” asks a skeptical London journalist. “Why, even China has grown disgusted with having her Christian settlements protected by such a quasi-pagan power as that of France, which, at home, marches its soldiers away from church, but, in China, pretends to want to march them into it.” This writer might have quieted himself with the assurance that it was French Catholics who planted Catholicity in China. Yet, the difficulty is a grave one for Protestant apologists, and it may be well to devote a moment to considering it.

The ordinary idea of “a Catholic country” is “a country of which the majority are Catholics.” France, with a government practically infidel, Austria, with a government practically Catholic, Ireland, with a government practically Protestant, are admittedly Catholic countries. Yet, we must remember that, as to Protestant countries, where a Catholic minority has great force, or even as to anti-Christian countries, where a Catholic minority has gained a footing, the gain or loss of the Catholic Church (in the admittedly Catholic mother-country) must be reckoned in connection with its missions. China’s 2,000,000 of Catholics, with its 28 bishops and vicars apostolic, with its 230 French missionaries, and its (about) 600 Jesuit missionaries, must be “put down” to the credit of Catholic nations—must be regarded as integral parts of those nations. So, too, the Dominicans and Augustinians from Spain, with help, also, from Belgium and other countries, must be allowed to claim (Catholic) China as adding to those Catholic “gains,” which may be justly attributed to their own countries. And, again, in regard to the Indies,—where Leo XIII. has just created a complete Catholic hierarchy,—the number of Catholics in British India alone is computed at 1,349,878, while in the Portuguese territory there are over 252,400. When we add 3,320 churches, 1,652 schools, 41 seminaries or colleges, 123 religious communities, and a variety of other Catholic establishments, we see that Portugal, France, and even England, may have a good deal to say about the Church *at home* gaining ground in foreign countries.

The Catholic population of the Indies is not very far short of

2,000,000, and its increase (by well authorized statistics) is not less than 12,000 a year. Now, when we are trying to answer the question, "Is the Church gaining or losing ground in Catholic countries?" we may fairly answer: "We must be allowed to take into computation the ground gained by Catholic countries in pagan countries." An Indian baptized at Goa by a French priest may be claimed by that French priest for a French Catholic. Father Grassi, in any missionary victory in North America, or Bishop Salvado, in any Catholic conquest in New Norcia, may write home to say that his own country counts one more Catholic; that there is a "gain" of one soul to the mother-land. This is a perfectly legitimate view of "gain and loss." We all remember what Macaulay said about the Church in the New World gaining more than she had lost in the Old World; and so it is to-day, and ever will be, so long as the Catholic Church shall stay on earth. A loss in the home-country is made up in a foreign country; but it was the home missionary who sowed, tilled and reaped the wheat. A Catholic community may wear the laurel of all its conquests all over the world, regarding its missionaries and their converts as Catholic brothers.

Some people have argued that the Catholic Church must be gaining ground, in its relations to the national political power, if the respect which is shown to the Catholic chief is greater than that shown to the non-Catholic chief. As an illustration: The present position of Dr. Walsh, the patriotic Archbishop of Dublin, is evidenced as showing both that Irish Catholics have gained ground, and that the English government has had to acknowledge that they have done so. The argument might, perhaps, be pushed too far. What is shown by such a fact is that the Supreme Pontiff fully recognizes that there is no conflict with Catholic principles in the Irish struggle, and that the English government has had to "eat humble pie," in being told this fact plainly by the Pontiff. It would not be accurate to conclude that St. Thomas Becket, by his contests with Henry II. (like Dunstan or Langton in the same country, or like Ximenes in Catholic Spain), proved that the principles for which *he* contended were the principles in highest favor among Catholics. All that was proved was, that the respect commanded by exalted Catholics was greater than the respect commanded by any one else. But this was a respect for their sublime office. The present Catholic Archbishop of Westminster has a much higher ecclesiastical influence in England—among all bodies or sects of professing Christians—than has any Anglican bishop or archbishop. The whole world *recognizes* a Catholic dignitary. Cardinal Newman has a higher place, intellectually,—in connection with his Christian influence or example,—than has the present

respected occupant of the See of Canterbury. The recognition of ecclesiastical force is conceded *solely* to Catholic dignitaries. And this fact, as it is established in Protestant countries, must be taken as showing that the Protestant estimate of the Catholic religion is not affected by the scandalous "accidents" of some Catholic countries. The truth is, that intelligent Protestants fully recognize the parentage of all anti-Catholic movements in Catholic countries, knowing that the "Reformation" has simply developed, in these days, into a ripened and perfectly logical antitheism. What is Christian among non-Catholics is solely Catholic—and there are millions of thoroughly honest and earnest Protestants. Yet, all educated non-Catholics recognize these two facts: that the scandals in Catholic countries are *not* Catholic, and that the divine authority of the Holy See is as widely recognized in our own time as when Sir Thomas Moore laid his head upon the block.

It is a saying of Cardinal Newman, that Protestants have this advantage, in quoting scandals from the history of the Catholic Church, that they can travel over a period of eighteen centuries, whereas their own religion has lasted only three. Suppose that, in the days of St. Athanasius,—when "Athanasius contra mundum" summed "the loss,"—the question had been asked: "Is the Church gaining or losing ground in Catholic countries?" we can well imagine how the anti-Catholics of that period would have insisted on their gains or the Church's loss. Such an example serves to show that both the black clouds and the blue sky are perfectly familiar to the life of our eighteen centuries. The oppression of to-day becomes the victory of to-morrow. Louis Veuillot made us smile, during the heat of the Bismarck warfare against the Catholic bishops and priests of his new Germany, by telling us how a stately gentleman had called upon Prince Bismarck, and asked him this very unpleasant, personal question: "How long do you think it will take you to conquer the Church?" Prince Bismarck gave the best answer that occurred to him. The stately gentleman gravely rejoined: "I have been trying my best for eighteen centuries, but without success, to accomplish what *you* think to do in your little life." The sole results of the Bismarck warfare have been to increase the number of Catholics in every province of the new German (Protestant) Empire; and to force the eulogism from the now concessive Protestant Chancellor, that "Leo XIII. is the wisest statesman of the age." Thus, at any one given moment, it might be natural to think despondingly, "The Church is losing ground in this or that country;" and in less than a dozen years such an opinion would be reversed, and the Protestant enemy would be proved to be the Church's friend.

Doubtless, as has been suggested, there are *new* phases of an-

tagonism in the modern conflict of the world with the Church. Leo XIII., in a recent Encyclical Letter addressed to the Hungarian Episcopate, alluded to a few of these novelties. Things which are "out of harmony with the natural law, quite as much as with the Christian law;" the labors of the neo-philosophers, of journalists, of novelists, of masonic lodges, of innumerable secret societies, in the direction of banishing religion from education, and of secularising the sacrament of matrimony; the growth of anti-Christian Socialism (quite distinct from "advanced" views about democracy), which is parallel with the appalling increase of bitter poverty among the humbler classes, and of fantastic opulence among the higher or aristocratic classes; the consequent popularity of the fallacious principle of Prudhon (now warmly adopted by the proletariat), "Property is robbery:" these are some of the *new* phases of nineteenth century antagonism, which make it appear as though the Church were "losing ground." Add one other calamity: that, of all the great powers of the world, one only can be called Catholic in its administration; Austria being Catholic, but France and Italy being freethinking (administratively, that is, though not nationally); Germany being Protestant, Russia being schismatical, and the United States and Great Britain being "anythingarian;" and it is obvious that the Government forces of our present time are not ranged on the side of Catholicity.

Yet, on the other side of the question there is a vast deal to be said, in proof that the Church is "gaining ground." Let us very briefly refer to seven points: (1) The same literary activity which is ranged on the side of error is ranged on the side of the Catholic Church; with this advantage to the latter, that all Catholic writers adopt the *same*, but all non-Catholic writers a *different* advocacy. Catholics differ about politics quite as much as do non-Catholics; but in regard to the Faith there is no such thing as an opinion: the Faith excludes variety or mutability. Therefore the literary gain to the Catholic faith, during the last fifty years, has been a hundred-fold greater than has been the Protestant gain; since every one who reads Catholic writings is drawn towards the *same truth*, but every one who reads non-Catholic writings, to *different errors*. And it may be said that Catholic journalism is on the increase. It is a fair subject for congratulation that the Catholic Press of the United States includes seven monthly magazines and thirty newspapers. There is a similar progress in Catholic journalism throughout the world. And since Catholic journals offer far less "general reading" to their subscribers than does any class of secular or mixed journals, it is a certainty that the literary mission of the Catholic journalists has been crowned with greater success than that of the sectaries.

(2.) The conversions to the Catholic faith, throughout the world, have far exceeded the protestations of apostasy. And since every conversion is a confession of a positive, but every apostasy a protestation of a negative, the world is more edified by one conversion to the Church, than it is surprised by any amount of departures from it.

(3.) The establishment of new Catholic hierarchies in many countries of the world, or,—as in Great Britain,—the revival of two ancient ones, is a clear proof that, if there be any loss in any Catholic country, it is much more than made up in non-Catholic countries.

(4.) That in all those Catholic countries where there has been a political warfare with the Church, the Church is getting the better in the struggle; and this so much so that all respectable non-Catholic journalists point out the folly and the criminality of such a “policy,” is a proof that the “mind of the age” is full of homage for that institution which can always bend or suffer, but can not be broken.

(5.) The *only* religion which is ever attacked by any freethinker, in any country whether Catholic or non-Catholic, is that religion which is known as the Catholic; and this fact is sufficient evidence that, by politicians as by scientists, by historians as by philosophers, by good and bad alike all over the world, the intellectual position of the Church is acknowledged to be the highest which is known to that boastful activity, Modern Thought.

(6.) The visible unity of the Church has been made to us more apparent since the promulgation of the dogma of Infallibility; the visible disunion of all the sectarians and of all the freethinkers having been rendered more apparent *pari passu*. Thus the sensible force of the Catholic religion has been more appreciable in Catholic countries, during the very period when the new antagonism has been most rampant; its perfect oneness being a “gain” in a double sense—in enjoying the Catholic Faith, and in resisting enemies.

(7.) The utter collapse of all missionary Protestantism in every country known as Catholic, is a “gain” to the Church of incomparable value, much more than freethinking is a “loss.” Freethinkers in Catholic countries are the “free and easy” members of society, who *would be* free and easy if there were no vagary called “freethinking,” but who now adopt that fashionable cloak for veiling their hearts. So long as the Protestant sects affected *religious* superiority, they did enormous mischief against the Church; but now that in France and in Belgium, and above all in Catholic Ireland, Protestantism has come to a dead stand-still, and does not

even affect to "convert" anybody, Catholics have only one enemy—the infidel. This is a vast gain to Catholic countries. Two camps on the Christian side made civil war: there are two camps still in these days—but on opposite sides.

So that, viewing the subject all around, we may conclude, and with gratitude, that the Catholic Church is *not* losing ground. That her enemies will try to believe that she is doing so, and that they will make war on her to the end of the world, is too absolute a certainty to need discussing. They will be the more boastful, the more persecuting, the more delirious, in the exact proportion of her renewed vigor and her victories. Cardinal Newman, in one of his merry bits of sarcasm, thus laughs at the undying hopefulness of the Church's enemies: "She shall be always worsted in the warfare, ever unhorsed and disarmed, ever running away, ever frustrated, ever smashed and pounded, ever dying, ever dead; and the only wonder is that she has to be killed so often, and the life to be so often trodden out of her, and her priests and doctors to be so often put down, and her monks and nuns to be exposed so often, and such vast sums to be subscribed by Protestants, and such great societies to be kept up, and such millions of tracts to be written, and such persecuting Acts to be passed in Parliament, in order thoroughly, and once for all, and for the very last time, and for ever and ever, to annihilate her once more."

RELATIVE CONDITION OF WOMAN UNDER PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION.

I.

THE family is the source of society ; the wife is the source of the family. If the fountain is not pure, the stream is sure to be foul and muddy. Social life is the reflex of family life.

The history of woman in Pagan countries has been, with rare exceptions, an unbroken record of bondage, oppression, and moral degradation. She had no rights that the husband felt bound to respect. In many of the ancient empires of Asia, notably in Babylon, India, Thrace and Lydia, the wife was bought, like meat in the shambles, or like slaves in the market-place.¹ Every woman, no matter of what rank, had to submit to be dishonored once in her life by some stranger in the temple of Venus.²

Her life was one of abject misery and unrequited toil. Ministering to-day to the capricious passion of her husband, to-morrow she is exposed to all the revulsions of feeling that follow the gratification of animal appetites.³ "Among the Indians," says Strabo, "wives are purchased from their parents for a price equal to that of two head of cattle. They are treated as mere servants by their husbands, who have the right to scourge them as their caprices may dictate."⁴ To speak to any one of the wives of the king of Persia, or even to approach too near her chariot while on a journey, was punished with death. And it is worthy of remark that the same law obtains in that country even to this day.

In Scythia, Tartary, and other countries, the wife who had the misfortune to survive her husband was immolated on his tomb.⁵ The same inhuman custom of self-immolation by widows, or *Suttee*, as it was popularly called, prevailed in India, till it was abolished by the English government in 1847. Previously to that period, several ineffectual attempts had been made to put an end to the practice. The Brahmins denounced the humane efforts of the English government as an unwarrantable interference with their religion. We may form some idea of the frequency of these human sacrifices from the fact that, between 1815 and 1826, 7154 cases of *Suttee* were officially reported to have occurred in Bengal alone.

Another scourge of woman was polygamy. By its baneful in-

¹ Herodot., I., No. 196.

² Lecky, *Hist. of European Morals*.

³ Herodotus, B. I.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 199.

⁵ L. XV., p. 68.

fluence, her empire over the domestic kingdom was divided, and her conjugal rights were violated. No one can read Herodotus, the Father of History, without being painfully impressed with the loose ideas of marriage prevailing in Asia. Throughout that vast continent polygamy might be said to have been universal. The Zend-Avesta (or law-book of the Persians) prescribed no rule limiting the number of wives for each household. A maiden, remaining unmarried till her eighteenth year, was threatened with the most severe punishment in the life to come.¹ They regarded the strength of the nation as depending more upon the number of children than upon integrity of morals.

The Medes, according to the testimony of Strabo, were compelled by law to have at least seven wives. The Mongols, the Tartars, and the people of the ancient empire of China legally sanctioned community of wives. The same custom prevailed among the Massagetæ, as Herodotus affirms.² Polygamy was regarded as honorable among the ancient Huns and Goths. A man's dignity was estimated by the number of his wives. In no country was the domestic life more grossly dishonored than in Great Britain.³

Tacitus represents the domestic life of the Germans in a very favorable light. His honest indignation at the moral corruption of his country-women may have prompted him to embellish the sanctity of marriage among the Germans. Of nearly all barbarous nations, he says that they alone were content with one wife, excepting the nobles, who had a retinue of wives, more from a sense of dignity than from luxury. Swift and severe was the punishment meted out to an adulterous wife. Her hair was cut off, and she was lashed naked through the street by her injured husband.⁴

"Among the Gauls," says Strabo, "the occupations of the two sexes are distributed in a manner opposite to that which obtains among us. The cultivation of the land and a life of drudgery were imposed on wives, whilst the husbands devoted their time to war-like pursuits."⁵

Aristotle justly boasts that, in Greece, woman was not degraded to the level of a slave, as in Asia.⁶ But it must be added that, if she was not treated as a slave, she was regarded as a minor. She was under a perpetual tutelage, first to her father, who disposed of her for a price; next, to her husband; and, lastly, in her widowhood, to her sons. Even if she had no sons, she was not free; for her husband could appoint a guardian to succeed him after death. The Greek wife lived in almost entire seclusion, she and

¹ Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, I., p. 407.

² *Cæsar, Comment.*, I., v.

³ B. IV., p. 66.

⁴ B. I., No. 215.

⁵ *German.*, ch. xix.

⁶ *Politic.*, I., l. 5.

her husband occupying separate parts of the house. She never went abroad unless accompanied by a female slave; she received no male visitors in the absence of her husband, and she was not permitted even to eat at her own table when male guests were present; she was denied the luxury of a polite education, her instruction being usually confined to the most necessary household duties, and to a limited knowledge of music and dancing, which was afforded her, not for the entertainment of herself and family, but to enable her to take part in certain religious festivals.

The domestic life of Greece, it is true, was founded on monogamy. But whilst the law restricted the husband to one wife as his helpmate and domestic guardian, it tolerated and even sanctioned the *hetairai*, who bore to him the relation of inferior wives, and who enjoyed his society more frequently and received more homage from him than his lawful spouse.¹ And whilst the education of the wife was of a most elementary character, the greatest care was lavished in cultivating the minds of the *hetairai*, that they might entertain their paramour by their wit while they fascinated him by their charms. The wife was the beast of burden; the mistress was the petted and pampered animal. These *hetairai* derived additional importance from being legally chosen to offer sacrifice on certain public occasions. This demoralizing system, so far from being deplored, was actually defended and patronized by statesmen, philosophers, and leaders of public opinion, such as Demosthenes, Pericles, Lysias, Aristotle, and Epicurus.

Solon erects in Athens a temple to Venus, the goddess of impure love. Greece is full of such temples, whilst there is not one erected to chaste, conjugal love.² No virtuous woman has ever left a durable record in the history of Greece.

The husband could put away his wife according to his capricious humor, and take a fairer, younger, and richer bride. He could dissolve the marriage bond without other formality than an attestation in writing before the archon; and the wife had practically no power to refuse, as she was completely under the dominion of her husband. She was a mere chattel, marketable at will; nor had she any power to dissolve the marriage without her husband's consent.

Such is the dark but truthful picture of woman exhibited before us in the most polished nation of Pagan antiquity. Now, the sport of man's passions; soon after, she is the victim of his irresponsible hatred. Denied access to her own table in the presence of strangers, she leads a dreary, monotonous life in the society of her slaves. Her very position of wife debars her from a refined edu-

¹ "The Gentile and the Jew," II., 235 *et seq.*

² Bossuet, *Hist. Univer.*, p. 198.

cation, which is sedulously bestowed on the mistress. She is doomed to a life of domestic bondage ; the other enjoys the widest liberty. How can she give her heart to her husband, since she sees his affections divided among usurping rivals ? Conjugal love must be reciprocal. She does not reign as queen and mistress of her household, but serves as a tenant at will. Her wishes are not consulted about her marriage or her divorce. Should her husband precede her to the grave, her condition is not improved.

In a word, the most distinguished Greek writers treat woman with undisguised contempt ; they describe her as the source of every evil to man. One of their poets said that marriage brings but two happy days to the husband—the day of his espousals and the day on which he lays his wife in the tomb.

Hesiod calls women “ an accursed brood, and the chief scourge of the human race.” The daily prayer of Socrates was a thanksgiving to the gods that he was born neither a slave nor a woman. And we have only to glance at the domestic life of Turkey to-day to be convinced that woman fares no better under modern Mohammedanism than she did in ancient Greece.

The Mohammedan husband has merely to say to his wife : “ Thou art divorced,” and the bond is dissolved. To his followers Mohammed allowed four wives ; to himself an unlimited number was granted by a special favor of Heaven.

The moral standard of the Lacedæmonian wives was far lower than that of the Athenians. They were taught, when maidens, to engage in exercises that strengthened the body and imparted grace to their movements, but at the sacrifice of female modesty. The idea of conjugal fidelity was not seriously entertained. Adultery was so common that it was scarcely regarded as a crime. Aristotle says that the Spartan wives lived in unbridled licentiousness.¹

Passing from Greece to Italy, we find that monogamy was, at least nominally, upheld in Rome, especially during the earlier days of the Republic. But, while the wife was summarily punished for the violation of the marriage vows, the husband's marital transgressions were committed with impunity.

Toward the end of the Republic, and during the Empire, the disorders of nuptial life increased to an alarming extent. There was a fearful rebound on the part of Roman wives, particularly among the upper classes, from the restraints of former days to the most unlimited license. They rivalled the wantonness of the sterner sex. So notorious were their morals, in the time of Augustus, that men preferred the unfettered life of celibacy to an alliance with partners bereft of every trace of female virtue. The strict

¹ Apud Döllinger, “ The Gentile and the Jew,” II., 236. Plutarch's *Lives*, *Lycurgus*.

form of marriage became almost obsolete, and a laxer one, destitute of religious or civil ceremony, and resting solely on mutual agreement, became general. Each party could dissolve the marriage-bond at will and under the most trifling pretext, and both were free to enter at once into second wedlock.

Marriage was, accordingly, treated with extreme levity. Cicero repudiated his wife Terentia, that he might obtain a coveted dowry with another; and he discarded the latter, because she did not lament the death of his daughter by the former. Cato was divorced from his wife Attilia after she had borne him two children, and he transferred his second wife to his friend Hortensius, after whose death he married her again. Augustus compelled the husband of Livia to abandon her, that she might become his own wife. Sempronius Sophus was divorced from his wife, because she went once to the public games without his knowledge. Paulus Æmilius dismissed his wife, the mother of Scipio, without any reason whatever. Pompey was divorced and remarried a number of times. Sylla repudiated his wife during her illness, when he had her conveyed to another house.¹

If moral censors, philosophers, and statesmen, such as Cato, Cicero, and Augustus, discarded their wives with so much levity, how lax must have been the marriage-bond among the humble members of society, with examples so pernicious constantly before their eyes!

Wives emulated husbands in the career of divorces. Martial speaks of a woman who had married her tenth husband.² Juvenal refers to one who had had eight husbands in five years.³ St. Jerome declares that there dwelt in Rome a wife who had married her twenty-third husband, she being his twenty-first wife.⁴ "There is not a woman left," says Seneca, "who is ashamed of being divorced, now that the most distinguished ladies count their years not by the consuls, but by their husbands."⁵

II.

The world is governed more by ideals than by ideas; it is influenced more by living, concrete models than by abstract principles of virtue.

The model held up to Christian women is not the Amazon, glorying in her martial deeds and prowess; it is not the Spartan woman, who made female perfection consist in the development of physical strength at the expense of feminine decorum and modesty; it is not the goddess of impure love, like Venus, whose votaries

¹ Plutarch's *Life of Seneca*.

² *Sat.*, VI., 30.

³ *Ep.*, 2.

⁴ *Epig.*, VI., 7.

⁵ *De Benef.*, III., 14.

regarded beauty of form and personal charms as the highest type of female excellence; nor is it the goddess of imperious will, like Juno. No; the model held up to woman from the very dawn of Christianity is the peerless Mother of our Blessed Redeemer.

She is the pattern of virtue alike to maiden, wife, and mother. She exhibits the virginal modesty becoming the maid, the conjugal fidelity and loyalty of the spouse, and the untiring devotedness of the mother.

The Christian woman is everywhere confronted by her great model. Mary's portrait gazes down upon her from the wall. Her name is repeated in the pages of the book before her. Her eulogy is pronounced from the pulpit. Altars and temples are dedicated in her honor. Festivals are celebrated in her praise. In a word, the Virgin Mother is indelibly stamped on the intellect, the heart, the memory, and the imagination of the Christian daughter.

The influence of Mary, therefore, in the moral elevation of woman can hardly be overestimated. She is the perfect combination of all that is great, and good, and noble in Pagan womanhood, with no alloy of degradation.

Hers is exquisite beauty, but a beauty more of the soul than of the body; it delights without intoxicating. The contemplation of her excites no inward rebellion, as too often happens with Grecian models. She is the mother of fair love devoid of sickly sentimentality or sensuality.

In her we find force of will without pride or imperiousness. We find in her moral strength and heroism without the sacrifice of female grace and honor—a heroism of silent suffering rather than of noisy action. What Spartan mother ever displayed so much fortitude as Mary exhibited at the foot of the cross?

It seems to me that some writers are disposed to lay undue stress on the amiable and tender qualities of Mary and of holy Christian women without dwelling sufficiently on the strong and robust points of their character. The Holy Scripture in one place pronounces a lengthened eulogy on woman. What does the Holy Ghost especially admire in her? Not her sweet and amiable temper or her gentle disposition, though of course she possessed these virtues, for no woman is perfect without them. No; He admires her valor, courage, fortitude, and the sturdy virtue of self-reliance. He does not say: "Who shall find a gentle woman?" but rather: "Who shall find a valiant woman? As things brought from afar and from the uttermost coasts is the price of her."¹ It is only heroic virtues or virtues practised in a heroic degree that the Church canonizes.

¹ Prov., xxxi.

In every age the Church abounds in women immeasurably surpassing in sturdy virtue the highest types of Pagan female excellence. What woman of ancient Greece or Rome can exhibit evidences of moral strength so sublime as have been manifested in the lives of an Agnes, an Agatha, or a Cecilia, who suffered death rather than tarnish their souls? of a Felicitas and a Symphorosa, who encouraged their sons to endure torments and death rather than renounce their faith, and who shared also in their glorious martyrdom? Pagan history furnishes no instance of motherly devotedness comparable to the strong and tender love of Monica, who traversed land and sea that she might restore her son to a life of virtue.

Every impartial student of history is forced to admit that woman is indebted to the Catholic religion for the elevated station she enjoys to-day in family and social life.

We may recall in what contempt woman was held by the leading minds of Greece. She was kept in perpetual bondage or unending tutelage; she was regarded as the slave and the instrument of man's passions, rather than his equal and companion, by nearly every nation of antiquity; and she is still so regarded in all countries where Christianity does not prevail.

The Catholic Church, following the maxims of the Gospel and of St. Paul, proclaims woman the peer of man in origin and destiny, in redemption by the blood of Christ, and in the participation of His spiritual gifts. "Ye are all," says the Apostle, "the children of God by faith which is in Christ Jesus. . . . There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither servant nor freeman; there is *neither male nor female.*"¹ The meaning is that in the distribution of His gifts God makes no distinction of person or sex. He bestows them equally on bond and free, on male and female. And as woman's origin and destiny are the same as man's, so is her dignity equal to his. As both were redeemed by the same Lord and as both aspire to the same heavenly inheritance, so should they be regarded as of equal rank on earth; as they are partakers of the same spiritual gifts, so should they share alike the blessings and prerogatives of domestic life.

In the mind of the Church, however, equal rights do not imply that both sexes should engage promiscuously in the same pursuits, but rather that each sex should discharge those duties which are adapted to its physical constitution and sanctioned by the canons of society.

To some among the gentler sex the words *equal rights* have been, it is to be feared, synonymous with *similar* rights. It was no

¹ Gal. iii., 26-28.

doubt owing to this misapprehension of terms that the attempt was made, not so very long ago, by some of the strong-minded fair, to introduce the glories of the Bloomer costume. But though the attempt proved a failure, the spirit that impelled it still survives, as may be seen by the various masculine modifications that have crept into female dress during the past few years. Where is the flowing and graceful drapery of former days that jealously shielded the modest wearer from gaze on the public street? Is it because the woman of to-day has laid aside what she looks upon as the cumbersome style of her grandmother's time that she aims at dauntlessly presenting herself at the ballot-box to cast in her suffrage for *A* or for *B*? Only a few years ago it provoked laughter to hear that Miss Jemima Snarl was to lecture on "Woman's Rights," or that Dr. Mary Walker had appeared on Broadway in male habiliments *cap-à-pie*. But now it is quite ordinary to hear of ladies, gentlewomen, daughters of some of our country's best men, not, indeed, imitating Dr. Mary Walker's exceptionable attire, but mounting the rostrum to harangue their audiences on the power of the "Faith Healers" or the merits of the "Salvation Army." Is it any wonder that a feeling of sadness creeps over one that such things should be? Fancy a fragile, highly-cultured lady starting up from her drawing-room surroundings at the alarm of fire, rushing to the scene of action, mounting a ladder, axe in hand; or her delicate fingers at play on the engine instead of the light guitar, while her ears are assailed by the coarse language of the motley crowd whose duty or pleasure it is to frequent such places?

To debar woman from such pursuits, is not to degrade her. To restrict her field of action to the gentler avocations of life, is not to fetter her aspirations after the higher and the better. It is, on the contrary, to secure to her not *equal* rights so-called, but those supereminent rights that cannot fail to endow her with a sacred influence in her own proper sphere; for, as soon as woman trenches on the domain of man, she must not be surprised to find that the reverence once accorded her has been in part, or wholly, withdrawn.

But it was by vindicating the unity, the sanctity, and the indissolubility of marriage that the Church has conferred the greatest boon on the female sex. The holiness of the marriage bond is the palladium of woman's dignity, while polygamy and divorce involve her in bondage and degradation.

The Church has ever maintained, in accordance with the teachings of our Saviour, that no man can lawfully have more than one wife, and no woman more than one husband. The rights and obligations of both consorts are correlative. To give to the husband the license of two or more wives would be an injustice to his spouse and destructive of domestic peace. The Church has also

invariably taught that the marriage compact, once validly formed, can be dissolved only by death; for what God hath joined together man cannot put asunder. While admitting that there may be a legitimate cause for separation, she never allows any pretext for the absolute dissolution of the marriage bond. For so strong and violent are the passion of love and its opposite passion of hate, so insidious is the human heart, that once a solitary pretext is admitted for absolute divorce, others are quickly invented, as experience has shown; thus a fearful crevice is made in the moral embankment, and the rush of waters is sure to override every barrier that separates a man from the object of his desires.

It has, again and again, been alleged that this law is too severe, that it is harsh and cruel, and that it condemns to a life of misery two souls who might find happiness if permitted to have their marriage annulled and to be united with more congenial partners. Every law has its occasional inconveniences, and I admit that the law absolutely prohibiting divorce *à vinculo* may sometimes appear rigorous and cruel. But its harshness is mercy itself when compared with the frightful miseries resulting from the toleration of divorce. Its inconvenience is infinitesimal when contrasted with the colossal evils from which it saves society and the solid blessings it secures to countless homes. Those exceptional ill-assorted marriages would become more rare if the public were convinced, once for all, that death alone can dissolve the marriage bond. They would then use more circumspection in the selection of a conjugal partner. Hence it happens that in Catholic countries where faith is strong, as in Ireland and the Tyrol, divorces are almost unheard of.

The enforcement of this law has been maintained by the Church against fearful odds, and has caused her many a mortal struggle. For if the strong government of the United States, with military forces at its command, with the sympathy of public opinion and Christian traditions on its side, is successfully resisted by a colony of Mormons, how violent must have been the opposition to the Church and how hopeless her task, humanly speaking, when physical force and inveterate custom were arrayed against her, and when she had on her side only moral power and spiritual penalties.

In vindicating the sanctity of marriage, the Church had to contend with a triple enemy—the fierce passions of barbarous tribes, the arbitrary power of princes, and the compromising spirit of rebellious churchmen.

From the fifth to the eighth century Europe was periodically visited by warlike tribes from the shores of the Baltic, from Asia, and from Africa. They threatened the overthrow of the Christian religion, and, in the general upheaval of society, the landmarks of

Christian civilization were well-nigh swept away. The invading hosts were utter strangers to monogamy and the restraining maxims of the Gospel. But when the storm subsided, the voice of religion was heard in defence of female honor and the sanctity of marriage, and the triumphant barbarians voluntarily submitted to the yoke of the Gospel.

Virginal and conjugal chastity found still more formidable opponents among many of the petty princes and barons of the Middle Ages. Fortified in their castles and surrounded by submissive vassals, they recognized no power that thwarted their lust; they set the laws of the land at defiance; they intimidated the local clergy; they disregarded even the authority of the bishops. The only voice before which they trembled and which compelled them to surrender their prey, was the anathema of Rome.

What a sorry figure the so-called Reformers presented when the honor of woman was at stake, and what little protection she had to expect from them in the hour of trial! Luther, in his commentary on Genesis, says that he does not decide whether a man is or is not permitted to have several wives at once; yet we all know that he did decide the question by permitting the Landgrave of Hesse to have two wives at the same time, his brother reformer Melancthon concurring in the decision. We know, also, how obsequious Cranmer was to Henry VIII. in sanctioning his divorce from Catherine. How different was the conduct of Pope Innocent III., who compelled the French king, Philip Augustus, to dismiss Agnes de Méranie, whom he had unlawfully married, and take back his lawful wife, Ingelburga of Denmark, whom he had discarded! And all know with what firmness Pius VII., in the present century, refused to dissolve the marriage of Jerome Bonaparte with Elizabeth Patterson.

The Protestant Bishop of Maine makes the following candid avowal: "Laxity of opinion and teaching on the sacredness of the marriage bond and on the question of divorce *originated among the Protestants* of Continental Europe in the sixteenth century. It soon began to appear in the legislation of Protestant States on that Continent, and nearly at the same time to affect the laws of New England. From that time to the present it has proceeded from one degree to another in this country, until, especially in New England and in States most directly affected by New England opinions and usages, the Christian conception of the nature and obligations of the marriage bond finds scarcely any recognition in legislation or in the prevailing sentiment of the community."¹ In confirmation of this statement, it may be remarked that, according to the latest census, there was one divorce to every eight mar-

¹ Quoted from "The Calling of a Christian Woman," by Rev. Morgan Dix.

riages in Ashtabula County, Ohio, which is the focus of the Western Reserve, a colony founded by New England settlers. Had the indissoluble character of the marriage bond not already taken so deep and firm a hold upon the heart and conscience of Europe at the time of the "Reformation," it would have been uprooted by the storm of licentiousness aroused by the teaching and practice of the "Reformers."

What woman can calmly reflect on these facts without blessing the Catholic Church as, under God, the saviour of her sex? If virginal and conjugal chastity is held to-day as the brightest gem in the diadem of woman; if the wife is regarded as the peer of her husband, and not as his slave, the toy of his caprice and passion, as are the wives of Asiatic nations; if she is honored as the mistress of her household, and not looked upon as a tenant at will, as were the wives of Greece and Rome; if she is respected as the queen of the domestic kingdom, to be dethroned only by death, and not treated as the victim of rival queens, like the Mohammedan and Mormon wives, she is indebted to the Church which always held inviolate the unity and indissolubility of marriage, and especially to the Roman Pontiffs who never failed to enforce those fundamental laws.

And if woman has been elevated and ennobled by the Gospel, she has not been ungrateful for the boon conferred; she merits the eternal gratitude of the Christian world for the influence she has zealously exerted and is still exerting in behalf of religion and society. It is fearful to contemplate what would have become of our Christian civilization without the aid of the female sex. Not to speak of the grand army of consecrated virgins who are fanning the flame of faith and charity throughout the world, how many thousands of homes are there in our country from which God withholds His avenging hand, and to which He shows mercy, solely on account of a pious mother or daughter, just as He was willing to show mercy to Sodom for the sake of a few righteous souls, as He restored life to the young man borne to the tomb, for the sake of his mother, the widow of Naim! How many brothers, who had been long since buried in the grave of sin, are brought back to a life of virtue through the intercession of a pious sister, just as Lazarus was raised from the dead by the prayers and tears of Mary and Martha! How many daughters keep alive the spark of religion, which otherwise would be utterly extinguished, in many a household! How many are in their families angels of expiation, atoning by their prayers and mortification for the sins of fathers and sons!

Women, it is true, are debarred from the exercise of the public ministry and the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries, for they are

commanded by the Apostle to "keep silence in the churches."¹ But if they are not apostles by preaching, they are apostles by prayer, by charity, and by good example. If they cannot offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass, they are priests in the broader sense of the term; for they offer up in the sanctuary of their own homes and on the altar of their heart the acceptable sacrifice of supplication, praise, and thanksgiving to God. Viewing, then, woman's dignity and her work in the cause of Christ, well may we apply to her these words of the Prince of the Apostles: "You are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people."²

But if we glory in the preëminence that woman has attained under Christian civilization, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that her moral dignity is seriously compromised in many portions of our country by the lax legislation which assails the sanctity of marriage and threatens the very existence of family life. The cancer of divorce is rapidly spreading over the community and poisoning the fountains of the nation; unless the evil is checked by some speedy and heroic remedy, we shall not have much to boast of in comparison with Rome under the Empire, and shall have little left of Christianity except the name. How can we call ourselves a Christian people if we violate the fundamental principle of Christianity? And if the sanctity of marriage does not constitute a cardinal principle of the Christian religion, we are at a loss to know what does.

We cannot view without alarm the enormous increase of divorces legally obtained in this country.

The following figures represent the proportion of divorces to marriages in the six New England States for 1878:³

In Massachusetts, the ratio was	1	divorce for every	21	marriages.
In Vermont,	"	"	1	"
In Rhode Island,	"	"	1	"
In New Hampshire,	"	"	1	"
In Connecticut,	"	"	1	"
In Maine,	"	"	1	"

The average proportion, therefore, of divorces to marriages in all the New England States was 1 to 12. Now two important facts have to be borne in mind, which give a still darker coloring to this gloomy picture: 1st, In the aggregate number of marriages, are included those of Catholics, who do not seek divorce, and the members of the Catholic Church may be roughly set down as forming one-fourth of the entire population. This will put the ratio of divorces to marriages at 1 to 8. 2d. The relative increase

¹ I. Cor., xiv. 34.

² I. Peter, ii. 9.

³ These statistics are condensed from Rev. Dr. Dix's admirable work, "The Calling of a Christian Woman."

of divorces over the general increase of the population in those States since 1878 safely warrants the conclusion that, at the present time, there is one divorce for every six marriages outside the Catholic Church.

Let the imagination picture to itself the fearful wrecks daily caused by this rock of scandal, and the number of families that are thus cast homeless on the world. Great stress is justly laid by moralists on the observance of the Sunday, and there are few things more creditable to our country than the quiet that reigns throughout the land on the Christian Sabbath. But what a mockery is this external peace to homes in which domestic peace is destroyed by intestine war, where the mother's heart is broken, the father's spirit is crushed, the family ties are dissolved, and the children cannot cling to one of their parents without exciting the hatred of the other.

This social plague calls for a radical cure; and the remedy can be found only in the abolition of our mischievous legislation regarding divorce, and in an honest application of the teachings of the Gospel.

The tendency to imitate the social depravity of Rome in the worst days of the Empire is not confined to the practice of divorce; it extends also to the neglect of maternal training.

In Pagan Rome, especially under the Cæsars, the wife was frequently divorced not only from her husband, but also from her children. At a tender age they were withdrawn from the care of their natural guardian, and consigned to the custody of slaves, who commonly combined refinement of culture with refinement of immorality. Nothing contributed more than this vicious system to debauch the Roman youth of both sexes.

How many mothers are now to be seen, especially in the higher walks of life, who are so much absorbed by the frivolities and fashions of the times, as to be utterly regardless of the responsibilities of maternity. Reared themselves, perhaps, without order or discipline, the mothers transmit to their children the legacy of anarchy and misrule which they had inherited from their parents. They treat their offspring like pet animals devoid of moral sense; they indulge them in every whim and fancy without inculcating any idea of duty and restraint.

Their great aim is to emancipate themselves as soon as possible from the personal charge of their children, which they regard as an intolerable drudgery, and to pass them over to the hands of strangers. Happily for the children, the nurses and teachers to whom they are consigned are often models of Christian virtue. But this circumstance does not extenuate the mother's delinquency, nor exonerate her from the obligation of personal supervision. A

mother may be aided indeed by other teachers in the education of her children, but never supplanted. The education of the young should begin at the mother's knee. The mind of a child, like softened wax, receives with ease the first impressions, which are always the deepest and most enduring. "A young man according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it."¹ A child is susceptible of instruction much earlier in life than parents generally imagine. Mothers should watch with a jealous eye the first unfolding of the infant mind, and pour into it the seed of heavenly knowledge.

For various reasons the mother should be the first instructor of her children:

1st. As nature ordains that the mother should be the first to feed her offspring with her own substance, so does God ordain that she should be the first to impart to her little ones the "rational milk" whereby they "may grow unto salvation."²

2d. Those children that are nurtured by their own mother are usually more healthy and robust than those that are nursed by strangers. In like manner they that are instructed by their own mother in the principles of Christian piety, are usually more robust in faith than those that have been guided exclusively by other teachers.

3d. It cannot be doubted that maternal and filial affections are mutually nurtured by the closer and intimate relations that mother and child have with each other, while these affections are chilled by a prolonged separation.

4th. The more confidence a child has in its preceptor, the more he is apt to advance in learning. Now, in whom does a child confide more implicitly than in his mother? In every danger he flies to her as to an ark of safety; he will place the utmost reliance on what she says. The mother should not lose the golden opportunity of instructing her children in faith and morals while their hearts are open to receive her every word.

5th. Lastly, the mother occupies the same house with her children, frequently the same apartment, and eats at the same table with them. She is the visible guardian-angel of her children. She is therefore the best calculated to instruct them, as she can avail herself of every little circumstance that presents itself to draw from it a moral lesson.

Let Christian mothers recognize their sublime mission. Let them bear in mind that to them is confided the most tender portion of the flock of Christ, which on that account should be watched with the greater care. On them devolves the duty of directing the

¹ Prov., xxii. 6.

² I. Peter, ii. 2.

susceptible and pliant minds of their children, and of instilling into their youthful hearts the principle of piety. It is theirs to plant the seed of the word of God in the virgin soil, and, when a more experienced hand is required to cultivate it, the ministers of God will not be wanting in developing its growth.

We would exhort mothers in the name of the holy religion they profess; in the name of their country, which expects them to rear not scourges of society, but honorable and law-abiding members; in the name of God, who requires them to have their offspring fed with the nourishment of sound doctrine; we beg them, in the name of their own eternal salvation and that of the souls committed to their charge, to provide for their children *at home* a healthy, moral, and religious education. "If any one have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."¹

And, then, what a source of consolation it will be to them in their declining years when they reflect that they will leave after them children who will inherit not only their name, but also their faith and virtues. They will share in the beautiful eulogy pronounced by the Holy Ghost on the mother of the family: "Who shall find a valiant woman? . . . She hath opened her mouth to wisdom, and the law of clemency is on her tongue. She hath looked well to the paths of her house, and hath not eaten her bread idle. Her children rose up and called her blessed: her husband, and he praised her. Many daughters have gathered together riches; thou hast surpassed them all. Favor is deceitful and beauty is vain: the woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised."²

¹ Tim., v. 8.

Prov., xxxi.

THE COMING CONFLICT IN THE EAST.

WHAT has lately taken place in Bulgaria could hardly fail to attract considerable attention throughout the world, because not only diplomatic circles, but cultured society at large, couple these occurrences—and quite properly so—with a reappearance of the Eastern Question on the political horizon of Europe.

The abduction of Prince Alexander of Battenberg from his palace in Sofia during the dark of night, his transportation on a yacht to Reni, the counter revolution while he was on his way to Darmstadt, his triumphant return into Bulgaria, and subsequent abdication as ruler,—all these events took place with a rapidity truly characteristic of our age. They read like a romantic tale, and partake of a genuine dramatic character; but they are none the less real. And while they remind us, pleasantly, on the one hand, that even in this thoroughly materialistic century loyalty and patriotism have not completely died out, they open up, on the other hand, a vista into the future which fills observant minds with uneasy forebodings.

Perhaps a "*modus vivendi*" will be found to patch up once more, for a time at least, a truce; yet the final solution of the Oriental problem can hardly be postponed much longer. And this final solution, whenever it comes, involves, as is admitted by the diplomatic world of Europe, nearly all the great powers, and hence will be a struggle of gigantic proportions. It is by no means an exaggeration to say that nearly all the powers interested have been preparing themselves for this struggle for years, and this leads us to incline to the belief that we are on the eve of the day when matters will be settled in a conclusive way, and the map of southeastern Europe and Asia completely re-arranged. Indications to that effect are not wanting. It is impossible to dissociate the closing of Batoum, as a port of free entry, by Russia, contrary to the provisions of the treaty of Berlin, and the establishment of a coaling station on the island of Thasos, in the Ægean Sea, by England, from the troubles in Bulgaria. Nor is it at all possible not to attach any significance to the fact that both Russia and Austria have this year chosen for the autumn manœuvres on a large scale, which are now being held annually by every great military power, districts which, in the event of hostilities in the future, could not fail to form part of the theatre of war. If this choice of ground for sham battles was, as some contend, purely accidental, it is a very singular coincidence, to say the least; but in the opinion of keen

observers of current events, this choice of territory is not devoid of a deeper meaning. And so it would be easy to multiply the instances which furnish cumulative evidence that the pulse of Europe beats rather feverishly in anticipation of the momentous issues which the near future may disclose.

It is hardly necessary to remark that personally Prince Alexander, howsoever much he be surrounded with a halo of military glory and lofty sentiments, does not enter at all into the consideration of the Great Powers. Nor is even the fate of those long-suffering and downtrodden nationalities of the southeast of Europe, which began to feel the throb of national life only within the last few decades, the cause of serious apprehensions for the future. While it is undeniable that the Bulgarians, Servians, Roumanians, etc., are very deeply interested in the final outcome, they realize themselves that the decision rests not with them, but with the Great Powers, in whose hands they play pretty much the same *rôle* as the figures on a chessboard in the hands of the players. A discussion of Bulgarian affairs throws, consequently, at best only a feeble side light upon the situation. For a full and comprehensive understanding of the real issue, it seems to us indispensable to ascertain what lies beyond and behind the apparent complications. And since a brief historical review, going back as far as 1853, will go far towards elucidating what is at stake and why it is so, we will briefly summarize, first, what took place in the southeast of Europe within that period, and next, what changes were wrought in the situation in Central Europe.

In 1853, prior to the beginning of the Crimean war, Czar Nicholas I. laid down the political creed of Russia in regard to her foreign policy, in certain overtures made by him to the then English Ambassador at St. Petersburg, Sir Hamilton Seymour. Inasmuch as Russia has persistently from that time on endeavored to carry out the plans outlined in these overtures, it may not be superfluous to state, in a condensed form, their main propositions: Russia, first of all, desired to establish Serbia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, and the so-called Danubian Principalities (Moldavia and Wallachia, now known as Roumania) as states independent of the Porte, but *subject to Russian protection*, and proposed a temporary occupation of Constantinople, in order to facilitate the obtaining of, or rather to enforce, the consent of the Porte to this arrangement, *i. e.*, loss of territory. In consideration of England's acquiescence in these plans of Russia, Russia's consent to the acquisition of Crete and Egypt by England was promised. At the same time a direct and peremptory demand was made by Nicholas I. through Prince Menchikow, the Russian Ambassador accredited to Constantinople, that the Porte recognize a Russian protectorate over all the Christian subjects of the Sultan within

the dominions of the Ottoman Empire. The failure of the British Government to favorably entertain Emperor Nicholas' proposal, and the Sultan's firmness in upholding his authority, rendered it desirable for Russia to strengthen her hands otherwise. The interview of September, 1853, at Olmütz, between the Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria, the King of Prussia, and Czar Nicholas, was arranged, therefore, by the latter, with a view of securing an alliance of these powers against the probable coalition of the western powers, namely, France and England. Russia failed, however, to obtain more than a very conditional pledge of neutrality.

The Crimean war followed. Emperor Nicholas died during the siege of Sebastopol by the allied forces, and bequeathed to his successor, Alexander II., the carrying out of what may not inaptly be called his political testament. How, after a most stubborn resistance, the taking by assault of the Malakov by the French, under Pellissier, and of the Redan by the English, under Lord Raglan, in September, 1855, decided the fall of Sebastopol, and thereby the campaign against Russia, is well known. Diplomatic negotiations were opened, and led to the conclusion of the Peace of Paris, on March 30th, 1856. By its provisions Russia's ambition suffered a serious check. Moldavia and Wallachia, the so-called Danubian Principalities, were indeed united as Roumania, under Prince Charles of Hohenzollern, but as a suzerainty of the Porte. This defeat of Russian schemes served, however, in no way to induce the Government of St. Petersburg to abandon them. On the contrary, Russian money and Russian intrigues have continued ever since to cause disturbances, in order to create opportunities for carrying out her schemes. The uprising against Turkish misrule in the Herzegovina, in 1875, fomented by Russian money, led, after an unsuccessful conference at Berlin, to a declaration of war on the part of Serbia and Montenegro against the Porte. Russia espoused quite openly the cause of Serbia; but in spite of Russian aid and Russian officers in the ranks of the Servian army, victory remained with the Turks. Montenegro fought more successfully. In the meantime Sultan Abdul-Aziz had been superseded by Murad V., who, in turn, in August of the same year, was followed by Abdul-Hamid II. A six months' truce was followed in March, 1877, by the conclusion of peace between Serbia and the Porte, on the basis of the "*status quo ante*." Anxious for a palpable cause for direct intervention, Russian agents had, during that time, incited an insurrection in Bulgaria, the quelling of which, in 1876, was entrusted by the Sultan to the Turkish militia. The cruelties perpetrated by the Bashi-Bozhuks, though often but retaliations, were made the most of by Russia, and, skillfully reported all over Europe, created a general and quite just outburst of indignation against Moslem misrule throughout civil-

ized Christendom. The plenipotentiaries of the several powers met in December at Constantinople, and shortly afterwards a constitution was proclaimed for the Ottoman Empire. The Czar, however, in his rôle as protector of Christians, not satisfied with the provision made for the amelioration of the Christian subjects of the Porte in this constitution, declared war, in April, 1877, against Turkey. This memorable campaign, conspicuous by reason of a frightful loss of life and fighting of the fiercest character round Plevna and the Shipka pass, and ending, with the aid of the Roumanian army, in the signal defeat of Turkey, is an event of so recent date as to require but a cursory allusion. A truce of arms, concluded at Adrianople on January 31st, 1878, was followed, on March 3d, by the treaty of San Stefano, the main provisions of which instrument were: Territorial expansion of Servia and Montenegro and their recognition as independent states by the Porte, and a further recognition of Roumania's independence; the creation of Bulgaria as a new suzerain state, embracing Bulgaria proper as well as Eastern Roumelia; finally, cession to Russia of a large territory in Asia (Armenia), and in Europe of Bessarabia and the Dobrudscha, the latter ceded by Russia to Roumania as compensation for the assistance rendered in the campaign. England protested at once against the provisions of this treaty, as a practical dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire; the Sultan, for the sake of obtaining England's guarantee to preserve intact the remaining Asiatic possessions of the Porte, ceded Cyprus to England. War between England and the Porte seemed imminent, when the mediation of Germany brought about the convening of the Congress at Berlin. Not since the days of the famous Congress at Vienna of 1815, after the Napoleonic wars, was there ever in this century assembled a galaxy of more distinguished statesmen and diplomats than on that occasion at Berlin (June 13th, 1878). Under the presidency of Prince Bismarck, the Chancellor of the German Empire, the deliberations were held and participated in by such men as Prince Gortschakoff, the Earl of Beaconsfield, Count Andrassy, and a host of lesser lights. The modifications of the Treaty of San Stefano referred principally to Bulgaria, whose suzerainty to the Porte, under Prince Alexander of Battenberg, was recognized, while its territorial extent was limited to Bulgaria proper, north of the Balkans. Eastern Roumelia remained a Turkish province, but under a Christian governor, while the administration of Bosnia, Herzegovina, and the Sandjack of Novi-Bazar was entrusted to Austria. The independence of Servia, Montenegro, and Roumania was ratified. Since then the union of Roumelia with Bulgaria, under Alexander, acquiesced in, at last, by the Porte, as well as by the Great Powers, and the war between this aggrandized Bul-

garia and Servia, in which Prince Alexander distinguished himself as a military leader, and won the hearts of the Bulgarians, are the latest events to be recorded in the southeast of Europe.

Condensed as this review is, it familiarizes us with the last thirty years' history of that part of Europe sufficiently for our purposes; and we will now proceed to review, in a still more condensed form, what changes have taken place in the balance of Europe. First of all, we observe that the leadership in the councils of the continental powers has passed from the hands of France into those of Germany. The French Empire no longer exists; a Republic has superseded it. Nor is the German Confederacy any longer in existence; in its place we encounter a strong, united Germany, under the venerable King of Prussia as its first Emperor, the result of a signal victory of the German forces over the French armies. As a further consequence of this victory, we notice, on the map of Europe, Alsace and Lorraine as German and not any more as French provinces. Again, turning to Austria, it forms no longer part of Germany; the Italian provinces, Lombardy and Venice, as a result of the war of 1866, have passed into the hands of Italy; Bosnia, Herzegovina, and the Sandjack of Novi-Bazar, though nominally still dependencies of the Porte, make up, however, in reality, to Austria for the loss of territory in Italy. Italy has one sovereign less. The Papal States had ceased to exist already, in 1860, but the "*Patrimonium Petri*," in its strict sense, continued up to 1870, when Rome and its territory were likewise annexed by the new Kingdom of Italy. The Pope, heretofore an independent sovereign, is, consequently, now only the "Prisoner of the Vatican." Italy is, moreover, recognized as the sixth great power. In Russia, the assassination of Alexander II. by the Nihilists put his son, Alexander III., on the throne, while in the Ottoman Empire Abdul Hamid II. still rules over largely dismembered dominions.

This, then, is the situation which a cursory glance at the history of the last thirty years discloses to us; and before proceeding any further, we think it proper to emphasize two very conspicuous facts: Russia's unflagging determination to carry out the political testament of Nicholas I., and, next, the not less determined opposition of the other European powers to Russia's doing so. Russia, it will be observed, appears throughout that period as the champion of the Cross against the Crescent; yet, owing to the political complications, Ottoman misrule found support all along against Russia. It is well to keep this paradoxical phenomenon in mind, as it will help to explain the attitude of several apparently more Christian states than Russia towards the Porte.

And now we propose to deal briefly with the several aspects under which the Eastern Question should be viewed. In the first

place, there are geographical, *i. e.*, political reasons, in the strictest sense, actuating the Powers to assume the respective attitudes which they now hold. Next, it is our office to inquire into the sociological status of the case, which will show us that two different phases exist. Lastly, it will devolve upon us to examine into the nature of the religious elements and their bearing upon the issue. For, as will be seen presently, the Eastern Question, from each of these points of view, presents us with different combinations, and hence with different possibilities; and unless they are all put into the scale and weighed against one another, no surmise of what will occur can offer us the promise of verification in the future.

In regard to the first point, a glance at a map shows that the Russian Empire covers nearly one-seventh of the whole land surface of the globe. Its population exceeds ninety millions—the great bulk of whom are of one and the same race, and speak, with slight variations of dialect, one and the same language. On the north, Russia's empire nearly belts the globe; on the west, she touches Sweden and Norway; on the east, her borders are conterminous with those of the largest continent, while she also touches China and menaces India over Khiva; on the south, Germany, Austria, the Danube, the Bosphorus, form her borders. The possibilities of expansion in Asia alone are truly enormous. From Manchou-ria, north of China, Russia could overawe and gradually absorb the Celestial Empire, while from the trans-Caucasian provinces she can without much difficulty extend her dominions over Persia, subjugate all Asia, north of India, up to the Indus on the east and to the Persian gulf, Arabia and the Mediterranean on the south. Russia could thus establish an empire larger than that founded by Ghengis-Khan, larger than that founded by the Saracens, larger, indeed, than any that ever existed. And with such a vast empire, aspirations for universal monarchy are, indeed, by no means incompatible. To this must be added the fact that Russia is a vast centralized power, animated by *a single spirit*, moved by *a single will*.

These purely geographical possibilities seem already to require, for the preservation of a European equilibrium of power, that Russia's dreams of universal monarchy be restrained, unless the whole of Europe is to become Cossack. From a political standpoint alone, it appears as if Russia intended now to dispute the hegemony of Europe with Germany. And here let it not be forgotten that Berlin lies on the road from St. Petersburg to Paris. Shall the Slav supplant the Teuton, as the Teuton has supplanted the Gaul? This is the political view of it!

And now let us turn to the sociological side of the problem. Here, it appears to us, if not necessary, at all events very advan-

tageous for a full comprehension of this side of the question, to make what may, at first, seem a digression from the subject. We seek an answer to the query, What is the stage at which modern civilized Europe has arrived? What is the main pursuit of the leading, that is to say, the most civilized and powerful nations? We naturally consult Mr. Herbert Spencer, the acknowledged father of modern sociology.

Our readers will perhaps remember that at the end of his visit to this country a number of gentlemen of unquestioned prominence tendered to the distinguished scientist a banquet in New York, and that on this occasion he delivered a post-prandial speech which has since become famous. It is, of course, foreign to the purpose of this paper to dwell upon the fund of instructive information which he succeeded in compressing within after-dinner remarks of a short half hour's duration. But let it be briefly stated that he asserted that the law of evolution regulates the life of nations, like the life of individuals, with an unrelenting sternness and regularity, so much so that the forces at work in the mysterious web of existence have become factors of science. The study of life shows, he contends, a shifting of the purposes of existence. Man's first ideal, he said, is "war," which for a time appears to be the summit of his aspirations. As the second ideal, Mr. Herbert Spencer enumerated "business." But he maintained of this second, as of the first, that after a lapse of time it is destined to give way, since it leads "to deterioration, and if pressed to its extreme limits, to death." Before the third ideal of life's energy he pauses; he says science can neither define it nor point it out.

Now let us try to understand these, at first sight, rather mysterious assertions. What is to be understood by man's first ideal being war and his second being business? After a little reflection, we are constrained to admit that Mr. Herbert Spencer, after all, is right. Within man's bosom, individually as well as collectively, there dwells an innate and ineradicable desire to rule, to govern, to possess, to be superior to others, to own and direct; and in the first stage of life, it is to physical force, that is to say, to *war*, that we apply for its assertion. And not until it is seen by experience that even the utmost success of force fails to satisfy human ambition, and that a measuring of physical force does not imply a corresponding ascendancy in any other line, not until then do nations rivet their attention upon the second ideal, "business." Under that term there is to be understood the acquisition of wealth, and power, and distinction, and prosperity, and happiness, not by the application of sheer brute force, but by a proper exercise of the intellectual powers. As soon as this stage is reached, war necessarily recedes from first to second place, and becomes henceforth

a means to an end, but ceases to serve as a primary object. Now that stage, Mr. Herbert Spencer affirms, is the stage that has at present been reached by the civilized world, and herein we fully agree with him. The history of all nations, their rise, their conquests, their migrations, their fall, their whole civic and political life, give unmistakable evidence that "war" and "business" in the above sense play the part of determining agencies. But let us not here forget that Mr. Herbert Spencer does not claim business as the best and highest ideal of mankind's pursuit; far from it, he claims it simply as the idol of worship of our times, and inasmuch as, according to his own admission, it is an ideal of insufficient value, that very fact will serve to explain those mistakes on the part of governments which arise from their being given up to the exclusive worship of that ideal.

To explain still more fully the meaning that should be attached to the term "business" as a nation's prime object of pursuit, it may not be amiss to call our readers' attention to a rather conspicuous phase of modern history, namely, the colonial policy of all advanced nations. Colonization schemes, whether crowned with success or ending in failure, are, as we all well know, not merely undertaken for the purpose of hoisting a flag over some semi-barbarous and perhaps very unhealthy country or island; a much deeper reason underlies such undertakings. If we ask, "why did England acquire India?" the only correct answer is and will ever be, "because a sound perception of the dictates of political economy made an expansion of empire highly desirable, if not necessary." To be sure, England's colonial policy was influenced by many factors, such as climate, territorial extent, geographical configuration, etc. Yet its true basis is only to be found in the fact that the inhabitants of the British isles, being a nation full of energy, enterprise, and indomitable perseverance, and finding impassable limitations surrounding agricultural pursuits, saw themselves compelled to devote their main energies to industries and commerce; hence success for them lay and was found only in the conversion of raw products of their own and other countries into manufactured articles demanded by others. That idea always did form, and still continues to form, the prime motive-power of the foreign policy of Great Britain. Thus, the East India Company led to the conquest of India, and ultimately to the establishment of an Indian Empire. The same reason forced England to purchase the controlling interest in the Suez Canal, so as to be able to preserve and protect her vast commerce with the East. Precisely the same motive actuated the acquisition of Cyprus, for without a coaling station in the eastern part of the Mediterranean, a fleet of ironclads would be impotent to afford any adequate protection to the British mer-

chant marine. And so "business" again compelled England to interest herself in the Afghan frontier dispute.

Russia, it can hardly be denied, has only begun to emerge from the first stage; she commences only to leave the state of semi-barbarous indolence and to enter upon the field of progress. Now the pursuit of the first ideal drove Russia to a gradual subjugation of tribe after tribe, and thus the eastern frontier was pushed further and further east toward India. The products of these newly acquired countries required an outlet, the overland route without railways being too costly and no adequate justification for railway construction as yet existing apart from military reasons. Without ports from which these products could be offered to the world's commerce, no proper advance, no participation in enriching trade, is even prospective. Such an outlet, moreover, should be open at all seasons and accessible to ships from all ports in the world. Before 1880 Russia had already realized that the acquisition of Constantinople, owing to the concerted opposition of all the great powers, was not a thing of the near future; on the other hand, the necessity for a maritime outlet asserted itself more and more, hence Russia's advance in Asia towards India in order to secure a port on the Persian gulf. Now, without a strong foothold near India England could easily dispute the freedom of such an outlet. And in this sense, and not as a threat to the security of the Indian Empire, are, in our opinion, the Russian operations on the Afghan frontier to be interpreted. England's and Russia's interests clash there, and moreover clash seriously, because there is no possibility of gain-saying the fact that with free access to the world's commerce Russia would soon appear as a competitor of England in the carrying trade of the world. Thus we perceive how the pursuit of "business" creates between these powers a necessary and unavoidable and irreconcilable enmity.

And if we turn to France and examine into her foreign policy in Tonquin, in Madagascar and on the North coast of Africa, we find "business" as previously defined to be the *raison d'être*, and so also with Germany. The quite recent and very decided movements of the German Chancellor to secure colonial outlets for the German Empire bear out, we trust, the correctness of Mr. Herbert Spencer's statement that "business" is indeed the ruling force of modern statesmanship. So we see that under the head of "business" Russia's schemes conflict to an alarming extent with many European powers.

And now we will proceed to deal briefly with the other sociological aspect of the situation. The Czar of Russia, of all European Sovereigns, presides alone over a nation which is still in the ascendancy, or may, at least, hope for a career of ascendancy. Outward

surroundings, as we have seen, rather than the conviction of experience, lead the Government at St. Petersburg to consult the "business" interests of the Empire. Regarded as a nation in the whole, the Slav element typified by Russia still strives after man's first ideal. The Italian and the Spaniard have passed the zenith long ago; the Celtic, the Gallic and the Teuton elements have also reached their summit; while the great Slav family still continues in its infancy. Over ninety millions obey the sway of one will and are willing to lay down life even for the cause of the Slavs. The idea of a vast Slav empire, carefully nurtured by the Czars, finds a responsive echo in the Ukraine and on the steppes of Tartary. Russia is the natural centre towards which all members of the Slavonic family gravitate. Upwards of sixteen millions of Slavs are now under Austrian rule; add to these the populations of Bulgaria, Roumania, Servia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, etc.; think of all these Slavs united under one sceptre, obeying one command, and Russia in Europe would reach down to the Ægæan sea, encircle Hungary, absorb Turkey and Austria, until Europe became but one vast Slav State. A new civilization, born in the Muscovite realm, would supersede that of Austria, Germany, France and England; and Europe stands aghast, as well she may, before the sweeping change this ascendant Slav element could effect, if remaining unchecked.

And now to the last aspect, the religious side of the question, the last reason why Europe can never consent to let Russia carry out her dreams. Russia couples with her temporal ambition a fanatical zeal for the Greek schism, and is determined to carry it wherever she goes and to make her national Church universal. The Czar aims to be Pope as well as Emperor, autocrat in spirituals as well as temporals, and Russian rule threatens, therefore, religious liberty, the basis and guarantee of all other liberties. A still more powerful Russia than she is at present would necessarily govern the politics, the commerce and, outside of the Catholic Church, the religion of Europe.

All these matters have to be taken into consideration for us to understand why it is, first, that the power of the Crescent in Europe has not long ago been broken; secondly, why the one Christian power which stood up as the champion of the Cross against the Crescent, and attempted to drive the latter from the Bosphorus in order to plant again the Cross on St. Sofia, has been prevented by other Christian powers from doing so; and, thirdly, why Ottoman misrule and oppression have not only been tolerated, but why the Porte has, indeed, found England's purse always open, and all powers more or less ready to give her support, moral, financial and physical, against the northern Colossus, her hereditary enemy.

This brief analysis discloses already how numerous and momentous are the issues involved in the Eastern Question. In one sense, all of Europe must be up in arms to prevent the Continent from falling a prey to Slav despotism. In another sense, the more advanced commercial nations encounter in Russia a dangerous rival in the pursuit of their own object, while Austria's very existence hinges upon its success in hindering the absorption of European Turkey and of the young Slav states in the southeast by Russia. In a third sense, modern civilization clamors to be upheld against religious despotism. And still the subject is not yet exhausted. For the Sick Man of Europe, the distribution of whose last effects causes so much alarm, harmless by himself as he now is, because considerably weakened, has so far been left out of our calculation. Now the Sultan, it must be remembered, unites in his person nearly the same prerogatives as the Czar. As Mahomet's successor, he is the ruler of all Moslems, and in the extremity of a last struggle for self-preservation the fanaticism of Mahometanism may rally round the unfurled flag of the Prophet all faithful professors of Islam. Bearing in mind that millions of the subjects of the Empress of India are followers of the Koran, the possibility of new complications from this source cannot be denied, howsoever remote the same may appear at present. Let us suppose for a moment that Russia will ally herself to Turkey, and that thus the Greek Church and Islamism confront European Christianity. What a formidable array of almost equal forces! In this multiplicity of forces that, under certain circumstances, may be brought into play, and in the uncertainty *when* and *where* they will assert themselves, lies one of the main difficulties of the Eastern Question.

Not many months ago there appeared in Paris a pamphlet, presumed to have been inspired by Prince Bismarck, which created quite a sensation by the ingenious solution it proposed for the Eastern Question. Conceding that the Turks had outlived their power in Europe, and conceding, further, that Constantinople could not be allowed to fall into the hands of any of the great powers, it suggested the neutralization of Constantinople and adjacent territory under an international guarantee, and offering it to the Pope as independent Sovereign, thus solving also the Roman problem. Without attaching any significance to this curious production, it goes, at all events, to show the intense anxiety for devising some way of finding a solution of the Eastern Question that might prove acceptable to all. But it offers, also, food for reflection in another direction, inasmuch as it indicates that whoever wrote that pamphlet recognized the fact that, sooner or later, the present abnormal position of the Pope must also be brought to an end. If real greatness possesses one distinctive characteristic, it is the readiness to

acknowledge a mistake, if one has been committed. We need not allude to the unparalleled bitterness with which the Iron Chancellor has fought the Papacy for years; the extreme measures to which he resorted are too well known. Yet, having recognized this hostile attitude towards Rome to be a grave mistake, Prince Bismarck has not been slow in endeavoring to undo the mischief wrought during his earlier administration of the affairs of Germany. It seems to us that the choice of Pope Leo XIII. to act as arbiter between Germany and Spain in the dispute over the Caroline Islands, the abolition of the Falk laws, and particularly the way in which Prince Bismarck himself advocated speedy measures of relief, furnish very conclusive evidence that Germany would be glad to see the Roman question adjusted. We take this conciliatory attitude of Germany towards the Church of Rome to indicate, however, even more. We believe that the astutest statesman of the age sees beyond Herbert Spencer as a third and final object of mankind's pursuit an ideal that is closely connected with the mission the Vicar of Christ has to carry out here below. And here we will once more, by way of parenthesis, revert to Mr. Herbert Spencer. We fully agreed with him, as stated before, that "war" constitutes man's first ideal, which is equal to saying that in the first stage of life the elements of physical nature predominate. Heroic virtues, courage, valor, prowess, etc., are and will be idolized by youth, until human nature ceases to be what it is; nor can hero-worship be satisfactorily explained in any other way. And this so-called sociological discovery is corroborated, moreover, by the teaching of sound religion; for the first office of religion is, we are told, the subduing of animal nature. And, as to the second ideal, "business," which means, as we tried to explain before, the application of the intellectual faculties to the same object for which, in the first stage, only physical nature, "force," was called into requisition, this proposition, again, in no way does violence to the teachings of true religion, since theologians tell us that after the conquest of animal nature comes the subjugation of the intellect. And, by pausing before the third ideal, particularly after the emphatic declaration that the first, like the second, is insufficient, Mr. Herbert Spencer simply proves his honesty as a scientist and the superiority of religion over science. He dispels, therefore, the phantom of hostility between the two, and exorcises forever that abiding terror of all timid and superficial minds. The German Chancellor, we think, goes one step further, and shares with us the belief that the things and events of this world do not occur blindly or irrelevantly, but are all, throughout the farthest sweep of illimitable space, connected together and are orderly manifestations of a divine power outside of ourselves, upon which we depend and

which reveals itself to us in every throb of the mighty rhythmic life of the nations. He holds, therefore, that the next step in the line of progress must consist in harmonizing "business" as well as "war" with the third and last object of man's pursuit, viz., "religion." Outside of the Church of Rome, this belief, if it exist at all, is still crude, shapeless, without vitalizing force, without life-giving energy. In our own opinion, however, the law of probabilities holds out the promise that, when that fresh-born science, sociology, is once risen from the cradle in which it still lies as a promising infant, when it will walk in the vigor of fully developed manhood, this science will then teach to generations still unborn that neither "war" nor "business" forms the complete ideal of mankind, but the strife after that divine life which secures, individually and socially, the most perfect attainable happiness. It will, then, be understood that, just as much as it is necessary to become master over animal nature, just so much is it also necessary to bring the intellect under the dominion and rule of that higher law which forms the foundation of all belief by giving to the slave of time and space, as the ultimate object, a life beyond this earth. If we discard narrowness of vision, and look on the hand of winged hope forward towards the future of the human race, we may well think of a day when a successor of Mr. Herbert Spencer, in a city not yet founded, may dwell in a postprandial speech upon the third ideal of life as revealed by sociology, not as a surmise, not as a prophecy, but as a well-attested fact.

True statesmanship will then no longer be confined to the proper coördination of the two ideals that first appear on the scene, but will be able, by integrating these two in the third, which in import surpasses the other two combined, to cope successfully with those problems which now defy solution. Prince Bismarck, we take it, with keen foresight discerns that the struggle will end in the survival of the fittest, and he is certainly the fittest who deals not with one, nor with two, but with all elements that must be taken into account to insure correct results. It is for this reason that, in our humble opinion, the restoration of the independency of the Pope as a Sovereign during the combat accompanying the solution of the Eastern Question appears as by no means an impossible contingency.

But, to return to what we are mainly concerned with in this paper. On what side, and for what reasons, will the various great powers be arrayed, what combinations may, with reasonable propriety, be expected to be made, and what will be the final outcome? These are the questions to which we will address ourselves now.

As regards the Ottoman Empire, we deem it as extremely

doubtful whether the half-dead body of the Sick Man of Europe can be galvanized into sufficient life and activity to serve another term as a bulwark against Muscovite ambition. No doubt, the Triple Alliance can, if it chooses, drop once more the curtain, and grant another lease of life to the Porte, but its duration cannot be long. The sacrifice of Prince Alexander to the Czar's explicit desire to have him removed from the throne of Bulgaria for no other reason than this, that his independent conduct, as ruler, rendered him a *persona ingrata*, indicates, on the part of Germany and Austria, a desire not to force the issue; and Russia's solemn pledge not to interfere in the internal affairs of Bulgaria savors strongly as if some delay were not unwelcome even to the Czar. Germany's action may, however, proceed from her desire to humor Russia as long as possible, so as to postpone, if not to frustrate, an alliance between France and Russia. Germany and Austria have identical interests in the East. Prince Bismarck knows well that Russian ownership of the Balkan peninsula means the end of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. For the last ten years every effort has been made to alienate, as much as possible, the sympathies of the new Slav States from Russia, and affiliate them to the Austrian monarchy, and the relations between the governments of Roumania, Servia, and even Bulgaria, and their rulers, on the one hand, and the two empires of central Europe are far more cordial than those of Russia to either of the southeastern States. What is for Austria a question of existence in the immediate future, is for Germany a question of existence at a future date. With this difference, their interests are the same. The necessity of a counterpoise to Russia in the southeast of Europe is recognized not only by them, but by the other great powers likewise. The gradual dismemberment of Turkey has rendered the Porte too weak to serve as such counterweight. Thus, the only way to prevent Russia from carrying out her aggressive policy in Europe, is to create a new power. This may be done in two ways. The formation of a confederacy of Balkan states under the leadership of Austria, similar to the now existing relationship between the several German states forming that empire, suggests itself as by no means improbable. Neither France nor England could offer any serious objections, and Russia's reluctant consent to such an arrangement might temporarily be secured by giving her free hand in Afghanistan and Asia in general, an eventuality which could not fail to bring about a rupture of diplomatic relations between St. Petersburg and London, and a campaign in the far East. It would suit Germany and Austria to see Russia engaged in the East before serious complications, ending in war, arise in the Balkans, because the whole

concentrated force of the vast Northern Empire could not then be available in that direction.

Another possibility is a territorial extension of Austria down to the Ægæan Sea, and the union of the Balkan states with Austria by stronger ties than those of a mere confederacy. In this case a cession of the German speaking provinces to Germany, and a transfer of the seat of the new Empire from Vienna to Pesth lie within the reach of not improbable conjectures. England's consent could be bought by allowing her to take Egypt, a price that no doubt would be willingly paid and gladly accepted. France and Italy could not raise any protest *except* they were supported by Russia. And in this probability, namely, that they will be supported by Russia, exists the key to the whole situation.

England's interests run, *ipsissima natura*, so much counter to those of the Empire of the North that her position in the coming conflict cannot be considered doubtful at all. Germany and Austria, as we have seen, may endeavor to resort to every subterfuge of diplomacy to gain time within which to reinforce their own strength and stave off an approach of France and Russia; to gain that object they will be ready to make sacrifices. But we think that ultimately an alliance between France and Russia must take place.

It does not require any sagacity to perceive the immense advantages accruing to both powers from it. The German army would be divided so that neither France nor Russia would have to confront the whole strength of the splendidly trained soldiers of Emperor William. Russia, whose fleet is locked up in the Baltic and the Black Sea, would gain the assistance of the powerful French navy, which is now in numbers as well as in armament a match even for England. France, on the other hand, with Russia as an ally, can then attempt to realize her fond dream of revenge, for since Sedan the one preëminent thought of that nation has been to wipe out the disasters of 1870-71; and while she justly hesitates to measure strength with Germany single-handed, the popular feeling will drive her to break a lance with Germany the moment Germany is engaged otherwise. That point can hardly offer any doubt. If France can, she will retrieve her misfortunes, as soon as she may, at least, hope for success.

Italy, the least interested of all the great powers, may avail herself of the opportunity of Austria's engagements in the Balkans against Russia to obtain the long-coveted Italian-speaking provinces of the House of Hapsburg and the port of Trieste. Turkey, finally, remains an uncertain factor. Doomed under all circumstances to quit Europe and lose her dominions on this side of the Bosphorus, it is but natural that the Porte will try to throw her

weight on that side to which victory may seem to lean. Yet her attitude remains perhaps the most uncertain factor.

If we consider, in conclusion, the size of the armies each of the powers mentioned has at command, an approximate idea of the immensity of the impending conflict may be formed. Russia, the Colossus of the North, possesses on a war footing over 2,500,000 well trained, well equipped soldiers, with a possibility of raising that number to nearly ten millions. France can mobilize two millions within thirty days, Germany likewise two millions, Austro-Hungary a million and a half, with a possibility of more than duplicating that number; Italy has an army of one million at her disposal. To this mass of soldiery must be added England's forces and those of the Turkish Empire and of all the Balkan states, swelling the total aggregate to ten million men. War would be waged on the Rhine and on the Bosphorus, in Italy and in Poland and in the East. If we bear in mind that these modern armies have been brought to the highest perfection of discipline and training, that they are equipped with armaments which render the prospective loss of life frightful to contemplate; if we remember the enormous sums required to support this vast armed camp and the terrible drain upon the revenues these sums entail; if we also reflect upon the unavoidable amount of misery, desolation, wretchedness and poverty following in the wake, we may, then, begin to understand why those who stand at the helm of the governments pause and hesitate to assume the awful responsibility of uttering the word that will set in motion this vast machinery of destruction.

Whether it be possible even by the most powerful combination to check permanently the onward march of a nation which is still in the ascendancy, only the future can answer. To foretell the probable result would be to indulge in idle speculations of a most uncertain character. It is certain, however, that ere long the struggle will take place, and that it will be a struggle of unparalleled magnitude ending in a redistribution of power and territory. And it is also certain that, when Providence decrees, the columns will advance.

WILL THE TORIES GIVE IRELAND HOME RULE?

WHEN the British Parliament met on the 18th of August, everything looked extremely favorable for the advocates of the Legislative Union. The Tories overflowed their benches, the Liberal Unionists were in a state of violent self-satisfaction, and Liberals could not conceal the mortification, depression, and demoralization which the unexpected result of the elections had produced amongst them. Some of the events which immediately followed the opening day were highly calculated to increase the self-satisfaction of the enemies of Ireland. People had hoped against hope that the Liberal Unionists would return to their allegiance to the Liberal leader and to the Liberal party, and that the sight of a Tory ministry in power would be enough to shake their resolution and to drive them back to the arms of Mr. Gladstone. The Liberal Unionists took a very early opportunity of at once crushing these hopes. Lord Hartington made one of the most vigorous speeches of his life in denunciation of the idea that he had changed his mind, and gave it clearly to be understood that he and the Government were in opinion as one. Mr. Chamberlain went even further. In a speech full of vehemence and vigor he committed himself to the statement that he would never give a vote to put out the present Government if its successor were to be what he called a "separatist ministry." There were some obstinate optimists who were foolish enough to be very much disappointed by these speeches.

Even Mr. Gladstone himself was rather cast down. His nature is essentially sanguine. He felt the profound conviction that reason and justice were both on his side, and he would not entertain the idea that those who had served formerly with him would long resist the cause of good sense and of political comradeship. For this reason he had discouraged attacks upon his opponents by his own party. Everybody execrated the ill taste of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Hartington in pushing themselves on to the front opposition bench in order to thwart the Liberal leader and to support the Tory ministry. Representations were made to Mr. Gladstone that he should take some steps to prevent this outrage upon decency; but he refused to listen to this advice, and Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain were allowed to take their seats beside him and Mr. John Morley. At last, however, he recognized the truth and has made up his mind that by the end of this struggle Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain will be against him.

Indeed, many of the men who were in immediate political contact with him make no attempt at concealing the fact that they are irreconcilable. They state most clearly that they intend to support the Tories as long as Mr. Gladstone remains the leader of the Liberal party. His death or his resignation is the one possible termination they admit to the alliance of the Tory party; and the question now is whether they will be able to crush Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Gladstone will be able to crush them.

The session, however, soon developed a very different state of affairs. The Ministry had adopted a method of preventing any of those discussions of their plans or policy in which lie gravest danger. The language put into the mouth of the Queen was brief to boldness. The solitary reference to Ireland was a statement that the election had confirmed the adverse verdict against Home Rule, and it was almost impossible to find within the limits of this brief document any point that could be controverted or even seriously debated. Mr. Gladstone felt this so much that his first speech in reply to the Address from the Throne was terse and almost free from anything like disputatious matter. This was the result not merely of boldness of the Queen's Speech, but also of his own view of the situation.

Public opinion, too, was dead against the revival for the moment of the Home Rule controversy. The inevitable ebb of fatigue and apathy had succeeded to the full tide of enthusiasm in which the election had been fought. Then Mr. Gladstone had done many things during the election which enabled his enemies to scoff. He had gone on the stump through the country, had delivered a series of remarkable speeches which had led to enormous demonstrations, and in this way had been forced to keep himself largely before the public. His eagerness for the success of his policy had also induced him to take every possible step to assure the victory, and he had written innumerable letters and telegrams in favor of Home Rule candidates. These things had spread the idea that Mr. Gladstone was losing his temper; and the loss of temper is one of the unforgivable sins with the political public of England. His watchful and venomous enemies were preparing, under these circumstances, for an explosion of wild and childish wrath against all his opponents when Parliament met. It was for this reason that the late Premier felt the necessity of adopting an attitude of tranquillity and reserve, and that he abstained from as vigorous criticism of the Queen's Speech as might have been expected. But the great reason for the attitude of Mr. Gladstone was the character of the Queen's Speech itself. Saying nothing, it saved itself from criticism. To attack it was to fight with a phantom, and accordingly Mr. Gladstone contented himself with a brief recapitulation of his

opinions on the Irish question, and an expression of his unalterable resolve to work for Irish self-government.

The speech of Lord Randolph Churchill made a revolutionary change in this situation. The new Tory leader delivered an address which ranged far beyond the narrow limits of the Queen's Speech, and elaborated a large and ambitious programme for the future. The Ministry did not intend to be as idle and as uncommitted as their Queen's Speech. They had a paragraph, partly consisting of vague promises as to the future, and also definite statements as to the immediate present. The future would be provided for by a series of commissions, who would inquire into nearly every subject of Irish complaint. A commission would investigate the question of judicial rents; another commission would inquire as to the industrial probabilities of Ireland, and a general officer would be sent to Kerry for the purpose of restoring order in that district. But while a commission was thus to inquire into the judicial rents, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was careful to explain that these judicial rents would not be interfered with. "If there are any persons in this House," he said, "who are of opinion that there will be, by the Government, any interference with, or suspension of, legislation, or the neglect of executive action, of the right of landlords to recover their land, in the event of the non-payment of rent, they fall into great and serious error." And again: "A serious mistake," he said, "will be made by any who think that the Government contemplate any further dealing with the land question in Ireland, in the direction of any revision of the rent, by the interposition of the State. This is altogether apart from the policy of the present Government." And then he went on to utter a strong denunciation of the system of dual ownership, established by the Land Act of 1881, and to declare that the policy of the Government would be to transform dual into single ownerships; in other words, to establish a peasant proprietary. Before turning from this part of the policy of the Government, we may make a passing observation, that the criticisms of Lord Randolph Churchill upon the dual ownership under the Land Act of 1881 might have been stolen from hundreds of speeches of the same character, delivered by the Irish members, and by the speakers of the Land League, in 1881.

Here was an annunciation of a policy with a vengeance. That night little was said by the English members, who were not yet in full possession of their spirits and wills. Besides, the Liberal Party were entirely ignorant of the very important speech that was being delivered elsewhere while they were listening to the address of Lord Randolph Churchill. In the House of Lords, at that very moment, the other Tory leader had been describing the same

policy, but in doing so had fallen into phrases more pointed and less adroit than those of his subordinate in the Lower Chamber. On the question of judicial rents, he took up the same attitude: "We do not," he said, "contemplate any revision of the judicial rents." But this was followed by another, and a more remarkable, statement. The dual ownership was denounced in pretty much the same terms as those employed by Lord Randolph Churchill, and then an important guide was given to the principles which would regulate any land-purchase scheme by the Tory Government. Lord Salisbury was still talking about the judicial rents, and while generally defending them as righteous, admitted that there might be some cases of hardship; but he went on: "But if it should come out that the courts have made blunders, and that there is that impossibility in any case of paying rent, I think it is not the landlords who should bear the loss. I think this would be one of the cases for the application of the principle of purchase by the State, and that the State, and not the landlords, must suffer for the errors that have been made." The Liberal Party immediately saw the vast importance of this full and disastrous revelation of Tory policy. When the story of the general election of 1886 comes to be told, it will be found that the hostility to the Land Purchase Bill of Mr. Gladstone did more to create the majority against him than hostility to his Home Rule proposals. Throughout the elections, too, he had been assailed upon this part of his policy with the most virulent and most unscrupulous attack. The truth had been suppressed; lies had been suggested; misrepresentation reached Alpine heights. In nearly every constituency the Tories or the Liberal Unionists displayed cartoons, in which the honest British workman was exhibited as standing appalled before the statement of Mr. Gladstone, that he had to pay one hundred or one hundred and fifty millions sterling, and he sometimes soared higher, and the sum was fixed at 250 millions, and that all this was to be done to save Irish landlords, who have become an object of almost as profound hate to the English artisan as to the Irish farmer. Mr. John Bright and Mr. Chamberlain, especially, distinguished themselves by the vehemence with which they had denounced this part of the Gladstone scheme. Mr. Bright did not inform his hearers that in the Land Act of 1870 there are clauses which, to this day, are known as the "Bright Clauses"; that these clauses are for the purpose of facilitating the creation of a peasant proprietary, and that they are the very inception of the system of land purchase, through the agency of the State or the legislature of the British Empire. Mr. Chamberlain was even more uncandid; he had submitted to the Cabinet, while yet still one of its members, a scheme of land purchase devised by his own hand. In this

scheme, we understand, it was proposed that the sum of forty millions should be spent in buying out the Irish landlords, and a financier so experienced and so trustworthy as Mr. Gladstone declared that there was every probability of most of the forty millions being hopelessly lost through the faults of the scheme. The point, then, between Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Gladstone was not really whether there should be a land scheme at all, but whether land purchase should be to the extent of forty or fifty millions of money, and whether it should be passed concurrently with the establishment of a Central Council, or of a series of Provincial Councils. But Mr. Chamberlain could not be either cajoled or bullied, throughout the election, into saying one word with regard to his own purchase scheme, and the general masses were left to infer that he was opposed to any and every form of pledging the credit of the English Exchequer for the purchasing out of the Irish landlords.

Attempts had been made by the Home Rule Liberals, in all constituencies, to meet these misrepresentations. It had been pointed out that land purchase had passed from the region of controversy, and had, in previous sessions of Parliament, been accepted with equal ardor by Tories, Liberals, and Radicals. Moreover, the electors were asked to decide whether it was more likely that the land purchase scheme, so favorable to the landlords, and to paralyze the British Exchequer, would be passed by Mr. Gladstone or by the Marquis of Salisbury,—by a financier of genius, who represented the anti-landlord party, or by an amateur whose interests, prejudices, and passions were all in favor of the most extreme demands and privileges of landlordism.

The fierce joy will be understood with which the Liberals received the speech of Lord Randolph Churchill, and still more after the speech of the Marquis of Salisbury. Here was a vindication of Mr. Gladstone, but at a period much earlier than the most sanguine could have anticipated. Here was a revelation of the worst prophecies as to the Tory policy on land purchase. For some days after the hand of the Government had been thus revealed, the slender thread by which the coalition of Mr. Gladstone's enemies was kept together was strained almost to snapping. It was held that the Liberal, and still more the Radical, Unionists were placed in a perfectly impossible position, that they were presented the unhappy alternative of denouncing the plans of the Government or accepting plans they had hitherto denounced. The position of Mr. Chamberlain was especially infelicitous, inasmuch as it was to his harangues on land purchase, as has been already seen, that Mr. Gladstone owed a great part of his defeat. However, negotiations took place in the meantime, the net result of which was, that Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain were to throw the plans of the Government overboard,

and that the Government were to give a consent of silence to the projected annihilation of their own policy. In the course of the debate that followed, Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain both spoke with great dexterity, especially the latter ; but their dexterity did not succeed in hiding the untenableness of their position ; they also joined in an important statement that threw a great light upon the struggle in the country, and that largely strengthened Mr. Gladstone's hand in the future. They both avowed themselves strong supporters of a policy of land purchase. Lord Hartington, taking this attitude, was perfectly consistent, for with the straightforwardness which has distinguished him throughout this crisis, he always did express his sympathy with the policy of land purchase ; but with Mr. Chamberlain the case was quite different, for, as has been previously remarked, throughout the whole electoral contest he never, by the least whisper or hint, gave it to be understood that land purchase would in him ever find a supporter.

The country, then, for the first time saw the real issue between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Chamberlain, and it served to confirm the impression of the sagacious statesmanship of Mr. Gladstone and of the passionate unscrupulousness of Mr. Chamberlain. Here was much gained on the General Election, but a still more important announcement followed immediately after. In the absence of Mr. Gladstone, the leadership of the Liberal Party fell to Sir Wm. Harcourt. It was his duty to reply to the attack upon his former colleagues which Mr. Chamberlain had made. He took care to bring into clear relief the imprudent utterance to which, in the ferocity of his ill temper, Mr. Chamberlain had committed himself. If it were true that Mr. Chamberlain was, as he had said, determined to give no vote against the present Government as long as Mr. Gladstone and a Home-Rule Administration were to follow, then, said Sir William Harcourt, there was no necessity whatever for Mr. Chamberlain giving the slightest reasons in favor of the Government or of their policy, and whatsoever they proposed found in him a fervid and constant supporter. This was a dexterous appeal. In England, as in all other countries ruled by party government, there is a good deal of unreasonable as well as of reasonable party spirit. It is as hard to convince a Liberal that he is right in voting for a Tory Government, as to convince an American Democrat that the circumstances justify him voting for a Republican Administration, or *vice versa*. Undoubtedly the Liberalism of England received a rude shock when the Radical leader announced his determination to maintain as long as he could a Tory Government in power rather than permit the accession of Mr. Gladstone once more to office. But Sir William Harcourt had a much more important announcement to make directly afterwards. Mr.

Chamberlain had endeavored to fasten upon the late Government forever the policy of the recent elections; that policy was that any scheme of Home Rule should be accompanied by a Land Purchase Bill. The preceding pages will have clearly shown that this was an almost impossible policy, as some of Mr. Gladstone's strong supporters on the Home Rule side of his policy had been so opposed to the land purchase side of his scheme as to have pledged themselves in the strongest language to their constituents against it. To have pinned Mr. Gladstone then to a joint policy of Home Rule and land purchase, would have been to place him in a position in which he would have been compelled to disintegrate his party, and to lose for Home Rule the support of his most faithful and earnest followers through their hatred of land purchase, and then Mr. Gladstone and Sir Wm. Harcourt by a masterly stroke of strategy rescued themselves from this untenable position. Mr. Gladstone in his pamphlet pronounced himself still of the opinion that land purchase would be desirable, but he expressly at the same time declared that the two things which he formerly regarded as indissoluble could now be treated separately, and that Home Rule and land purchase were not bound to accompany one the other.

The House of Commons had not been made acquainted with the contents of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet at the time when Sir Wm. Harcourt was making his reply to Mr. Chamberlain. The announcement, then, that the Liberal leader in the future regarded the two questions as separable came with a startling suddenness like a thunderclap upon the assembly. Sir Wm. Harcourt first recapitulated the same views and successful arguments with which Mr. Chamberlain had opposed the Land Purchase Bill of Mr. Gladstone. "Yes, sir," said Sir William Harcourt in continuation, "I admit the force of these arguments, and I tell my right honorable friend, in making those arguments popular he has destroyed in advance the Land Bill, not only of the last Government, but the Bill of the Government that has come after them. Well, then," he said, "we are bound to treat the question of Home Rule and the question of land purchase as inseparable. He has tried to pin us to that, but he will not succeed in doing so. He cannot have his irrevocable and irreversible verdict, and yet treat it as if it had never taken place, and I say, in answer to my Right Honorable friend, and I am speaking the opinion of the member for Midlothian, that the two questions are not inseparable." These words had scarcely dropped from the mouth of Sir Wm. Harcourt when there ensued a scene—brief, but as remarkable as any beheld recently in the House of Commons. From the Radical and the Irish benches there burst forth a tempest of cheers—cheers that told of relief

after long pent-up anxiety. For the Radical members and the Irish members were agreed in the opinion that land purchase and Home Rule should be made separate—the Radicals because they had pledged themselves against it, and found land purchase a proposal absolutely irreconcilable with the views or prejudices of the working classes; the Irish because they had already seen the land purchase scheme destroy the prospects of Home Rule, and they were rejoiced to find that once more Irish liberty was not to be sacrificed to Irish landlords. And how was it with the Tories? Their shouts of disgust and despair almost reached to unmannerly tooting. They saw at once the masterly retreat which the Liberal leaders had made, and they felt that one of their great vantage-grounds had been taken away from them forever. But more significant than the shouts either of the Liberals or of the Tories was the silence of the Irish landlords. Col. Saunderson, one of the chief spokesmen of the Orange party, grew passively pale, and amid all the wild tumult around him never opened his lips; and to add to his discomfort there arose from several throats on the Irish benches shouts such as, "How do the landlords like that?" "Landlordism is doomed," and other passionate phrases that marked the fateful importance of the decree that had thus been uttered from the lips of Sir Wm. Harcourt against the class which has wrought most of Ireland's ills.

The next day Radicals met each other with an unaccustomed grin in their eyes; they felt that the future had all at once been made clear and sunny instead of dark and sinister; and, for the first time since the general election, began to believe in the near and certain victory of their cause.

Sir Wm. Harcourt's speech took place on the night of August 27th, 1886, only nine days after the effective work of the session had begun; and already the situation had been transformed and the Government greatly damaged. This was in complete accordance with the views of those who declared that the coalition of the heterogeneous elements of hostility to Mr. Gladstone could not endure the strain of Parliamentary discussion. It was not long before another event arose which subjected the temporary alliance to a further rude shock. After the close of the debate on the Address Lord Randolph Churchill had to move a motion asking for the whole time of the House. Mr. Parnell had previously laid before Parliament a statement of things in Ireland, the desperate straits to which the farmers were reduced by the revolutionary fall of prices, and pointed out the necessity of some new legislation for meeting this crisis. These declarations both the Government and Mr. Chamberlain had set at nought, and the Irish farmers were thus left to face the winter with the prospect of making their choice

between violent resistance to the payment of impossible rents or tame submission to wholesale eviction. On Lord Randolph Churchill's motion for taking up the whole of the time of the House a last attempt was made to save Ireland from this calamity, and Mr. John Dillon proposed an amendment calling upon the Government to introduce immediate legislation to meet the emergency in Ireland. In the course of the debate upon this amendment Mr. Parnell made a dexterous suggestion; he declared his complete readiness to allow the Government all the time of the House if they would consent to give him a day for the discussion of a definite measure for dealing with the Irish case. He indicated the lines which this measure would take, following up similar suggestions he had made on his own amendment a few days previously. The courts would have power to revise the rents with the view to the fall in agricultural prices; to stay proceedings where they thought a case had been made out for an abatement on payment of a certain instalment of the rent; and he proposed also a clause admitting the leaseholder to the benefits of the Land Act of 1881. To the surprise of everybody, and, which afterwards turned out, to the satisfaction of many of his own party, Lord Randolph Churchill swallowed the bait, and at once consented to give Mr. Parnell a day for the discussion of such a Bill. Ever since that promise the Bill of the Irish leader has engrossed public attention to the exclusion of almost every other topic. Again the Liberal and Radical Unionists were placed in a position of inextricable complexity and delicacy. In the course of his speeches against the Home Rule and land proposals of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chamberlain had committed himself to a remarkably strong statement as to the very question which Mr. Parnell's Bill now raised. He acknowledged that the price of agricultural produce in Ireland had fallen to between 20 and 30 per cent.; he declared that such a fall in prices must entail great suffering on the tenants, and proposed as a settlement the suspension of all evictions for six months—the landlords being recouped the loss of their rents out of the Imperial Exchequer. There was no mode of reasoning by which he could escape logically from this statement; and up to the time at which we write—which is before the discussion of Mr. Parnell's Bill—the general impression was that he would save himself by abstaining from attendance at the debate on the division. It will at once be seen that this weak and cowardly method of escape must entail its evil consequences, and must even increase the rapidly growing disgust for the attitude of the Radicals who support the Tory administration through thick and through thin, and through evil as zealously as through good.

Another remarkable fact, in connection with the effect of the

meeting of Parliament on the coalition against Mr. Gladstone, is the smallness of the number which the Liberal Unionists have been able to bring into the division lobby. In the division on Mr. Parnell's amendment, the Irish Party had 81 votes out of a possible 81—four votes being lost through Mr. McCarthy's inability to take his seat until the Derry Election has been settled, the absence of Mr. Redmond and Mr. Deasy in America, and through the double return of Mr. Sexton. The Liberal Unionists have a nominal strength, on the other hand, of 73 votes, and the largest total they have ever been able to record in a division has been something between forty and fifty. The real truth, with regard to this body, is that they are neither followers of Lord Hartington nor of Mr. Chamberlain. Each of these two leaders has a certain small number of personal adherents, but the majority of the body are independent atoms who have, in some way or other, drifted into their position, who feel very uncomfortable in it, and who are eager for an opportunity of once more being taken back into the ranks of their own party. On the other hand, there is a certain number, unquestionably, who are Liberals merely in name, and who would be extremely delighted with an opportunity of going over to the Tory party. As time goes on, they will probably make their choice in favor of the Conservatives, and will definitely join their fortunes with those of the opposite party. These men, of course, are bolters. They will not give a vote that can possibly subject their seats to the risk of a general election, and they will remain, in all probability, as ardent and as trustworthy supporters of the Government as any of their own followers. In Irish politics we have had but too much experience of this class of politician. During the years when the Liberal administration was coercing Ireland, they found no more strenuous supporters than some of the Irish members who had been returned as Nationalist members. And in the strenuous and unwavering support of such men the Liberals enjoyed an impregnable bulwark against the attacks of the Irish party. It is, therefore, not very easy to say what will be the future action of the heterogeneous body called Liberal Unionists. We think they will act differently according to their respective characters and purposes. Those who are drifting towards Conservatism will, probably, remain supporters of the Administration, whereas those who have the least degree of Liberalism left, and are anxious to remain with the Liberal party, will not be able to bear, for many sessions, the strain of the present alliance. The first pages of this article were intended to show how severe is the strain which Parliamentary discussions place upon the loyalty to the Tory administration of such men, and all this change in the relative position of parties has taken place on the very morrow of

the great Conservative victory and after but a few weeks of Parliamentary life.

It is at once the strength of the Irish and the weakness of the English position in an empire so widespread, with so many points of contact, with such an infinite multiplicity of interests, and with such an overwhelming mass of unsolved problems, that there must constantly arise questions of difficulty and dispute. It is all very well for Mr. Chamberlain to agree with Lord Randolph Churchill upon the question of Ireland; but that does not involve an agreement of opinion on India, on Australia, and, above all, on foreign policy. Events in Eastern Europe are approaching a crisis which threatens to raise issues of the most complicated and most delicate kind. It is possible that, on any day, the Government may take a decision which will make their further support impossible by any member of Parliament who ever hopes again to become one of the Liberal Party.

Then, there is always the great chapter of accidents, which plays in the parliamentary institutions of England a greater part than in the history of any other nation. Mr. Gladstone entered office in 1880 with a majority of 100 over his Conservative opponents, and in March of 1881 that majority had fallen down to 39; a few years later it had fallen to 28, and then it came down to 14, and, finally, the majority was transformed into a minority. All this was accomplished by the Irish party, as was shown on nearly half its strength by the apostasy of the nominal Home Rulers, and which never reached a higher total than 45 members. It is, therefore, easy to see that the inevitable hour will come to the Tory government as to all other English ministries, and that some question will arise which will make their further existence impossible.

We had written thus far when Lord Randolph Churchill made an announcement which marks the beginning of the end. He was being hard pressed on Wednesday, September 15th, on the Irish estimates, and especially on the estimates for the Local Government. The Chief Secretary had indulged in some pettish complaint as to the length of time the Irish members had consumed in debate on this most important subject, and Lord Randolph Churchill got up and made use of the following remarkable words. In replying to an Irish member, Lord Randolph Churchill said:

"The honorable gentleman was doing the Government an injustice in supposing that they had not given their anxious attention to those grievances. With regard to what had been said on a former vote, he thought that the functions of the Board of Works and the Local Government Board called for the most careful consideration from the Government, with a view to their development, so far as might be, in accordance with Irish ideas and desires. It

was the decided intention of the Government to make proposals to Parliament at the earliest opportunity, which he hoped might be next session. The object of those proposals would be to place the control of all those questions in the hands of the Irish people. Of course, that would be done within the limits fixed by the verdict of the constituencies at the last election; limits which the Government had neither the wish nor the power to overstep. The Government desired to act honestly, and at the same time practically, in this matter, and he appealed to that sense of fairness which he believed was never altogether absent from the minds of even the most violent and reckless opponents of the Government, to give the Government time to consider this large and intricate question; and if they failed in their duty by not bringing forward proposals, or making proposals which were insufficient or bad, then, undoubtedly, the Government would not be able to raise strong objections against honorable members taking the course they at present followed."

The importance of these words has been at once seen by the English press, and has been made the subject of universal comment. They indicate a considerable advance in the intentions of the Government. Just before the opening of Parliament, Lord Randolph Churchill defined to an intimate friend his policy simply as that of saying nothing and doing nothing. It is perfectly clear that this policy has already been found impracticable; it was, of course, clearly within the bounds of reason in the truncated session which was called together merely for the purpose of passing the accounts of the year. But it will be very different when Parliament meets next year for the discussion of regular business and has several months to run. If Lord Randolph Churchill should then endeavor to carry out the policy of doing nothing and saying nothing, he would place the Liberal Unionists in an equally false position, to which they could not reconcile themselves. They did not, during the general election, contend, any one of them, nor, indeed, did the Conservatives themselves contend, that the state of and relations between England and Ireland, which at present exist, were altogether satisfactory, and even the most reactionary among the Liberal Unionists declared for a large, if not a revolutionary change in the local government of Ireland.

The maintenance of the present state of affairs is perfectly impossible, in view of this declaration; and the question now is, not whether Ireland should have local self-government, but how much and how little she may have. Two theories are held, with regard to the manner in which Lord Randolph Churchill will try to solve this problem. The more probable theory is, that he will act in accordance with the views of the majority of his party, and those

views certainly are in direct antagonism to a scheme of so large and wide-reaching a scope as that of Mr. Gladstone. Two considerations are brought forward in favor of this forecast. First, that Lord Hartington is just as strongly opposed as any of the Tories themselves to a measure which would make the Irish administration and the Irish assembly independent of the Imperial Parliament. Secondly, It is held that the Irish question serves a useful purpose for the Conservative party, in being the bulwark against the advance of democracy. As long as this question is kept open, English reform becomes either impossible or must make its advances with a leaden step. The removal of the Irish grievance, on the other hand, would concentrate the attention of Englishmen on their own grievances and abuses, and, in that way, would give an enormous acceleration to the work of reform.

The other forecast is, that Lord Randolph Churchill will seize the opportunity of giving to Ireland a settlement at least as large as, and perhaps more enduring than, that which was proffered by Mr. Gladstone. There are some plausible arguments in favor of this anticipation. Lord Randolph Churchill is at once a man of keen ambition and clear vision. The follies and eccentricities of the anti-Ministerial days were the results sometimes of cold calculation, and at other times of an impulsive and irritable temper. He grasped, at an early date, the fact that the very first essential of success in a country recently democratized in its institutions, was to concentrate public attention. He deliberately came to the conclusion that wildness of attack and extravagance of demeanor were the most direct means of concentrating this attention, and the extraordinary and almost unprecedented success which has attended his efforts makes out a strong case in favor of the accuracy of his estimates. He is quite a different man from Mr. Chamberlain, who unites to great debating power an extremely shallow mind and an almost appalling ignorance of public questions generally. Mr. Chamberlain has no more comprehension of the Irish question than of the politics of Timbuctoo; and his ignorance is invincible, because it is that of self-conceit and of intellectual hollowness. Lord Randolph Churchill is entirely the antithesis of this. His father was Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland at the serious turning-point in Irish history, and Lord Randolph Churchill, at the time acting as one of his secretaries, was able to study the question with singular advantage. Then, he is a man who can see clearly into any question which he takes the trouble of mastering. His mind is cold, clear, without scruple and without passion. It would not cause him one twinge of conscience or of heart if, to-morrow, Ireland were to receive a legislature as independent as any that the most advanced Irish Nationalist ever

dreamed of. It is, therefore, held by many that Lord Randolph Churchill knows, as well as Mr. Gladstone himself, that Home Rule is inevitable, and that the only Home Rule which would have the least chance of settling the Irish question would be one that creates a real Irish Executive and a real Irish Parliament. His ambition and his own opinions might well lead him to desire the final settlement of the Irish question. It would make his name immortal in the annals of the two countries. For the Minister who closes the Irish question will close a struggle more prolonged, more fierce, and more complex than, perhaps, any ever recorded in human annals. Lord Randolph Churchill may, perhaps, not have the temperament that is specially anxious as to posthumous fame; but the settlement of the Irish question would bring immediate as well as remote profit to a Minister. It would give a prestige for political sagacity, parliamentary adroitness, and statesmanlike success which would make him an almost irresistible leader in future political conflicts. Lord Randolph Churchill, as the successful Minister who reconciled Ireland, would establish a claim during the remainder of his life, not only to the leadership of his own party, but also to the first Ministry in the Empire. Nor are there wanting personal reasons which might induce Lord Randolph Churchill to take up this attitude. The present position of the Ministry, of which he is the chief figure, is, in many respects, difficult and humiliating. They cannot take any steps without the previous consent of the Liberal Unionists. The Liberal Unionists are their dictators and masters. Even policies which they have decided upon, they have to modify or explain away when the *mot d'ordre* comes from their exacting patrons. Instances have already been given of the manner in which they have had to bow to this tyranny during the present session, short as it has been. The language of Lord Salisbury and of Lord Randolph Churchill on the future of land purchase produced, as has been seen, a scare among the Liberal Unionists, and it was only permission to explain away this language, or to treat it as if it had never been spoken, that led the Tory Government and the Liberal Unionists to act in concert together. Such a despotism is peculiarly obnoxious to a man of Lord Randolph Churchill's temperament. His whole character is one of impassioned and arrogant masterfulness; and to be checked and dictated to at every step by men outside his own party must be, therefore, extremely galling.

And of all the Members, the one whom Lord Randolph Churchill probably finds intolerable above all others is the Marquis of Hartington. With all its enmities, the House of Commons has no two personal hostilities more profound and intense than those between the present Tory and the present Whig leader. During

his years of parliamentary life, the Marquis of Hartington has been able to preserve an exterior of equable, not to say sluggish, tranquillity. The one or two occasions on which he has been found to lose his temper have been when he was called upon to encounter a question or a speech by Lord Randolph Churchill. Besides, Lord Randolph is a Tory democrat, and, like the inventor of that political genus, the late Lord Beaconsfield, he regards with especial loathing the Whig. This Tory and demagogic spirit finds far more kinship in the Radicalism and in the personal characteristics of Mr. Chamberlain, and it is no secret that between the two there is a strong personal attraction. A large scheme of Home Rule would have the effect of "dishing" the Marquis of Hartington, and there could be no more attractive temptation to Lord Randolph Churchill in favor of any policy. Furthermore, Lord Randolph Churchill, by a large scheme of Home Rule, would "dish" Mr. Gladstone. If any such scheme should receive the support of the late Prime Minister, of the Irish Nationalists, and of all or nearly all the Tories, it would pass through the House of Lords without any friction of consequence. To Mr. Gladstone Lord Randolph Churchill has probably no personal enmity; but then he may well be dazzled by the prospect of succeeding where the greatest parliamentarian of his time failed; and the prospect of doing that which Mr. Gladstone could not do is one that may well take his breath away.

However, whichever of these forecasts may turn out correct, the future of Home Rule seems equally assured. We have always regarded Home Rule as, so to speak, an inclined plane; the first step taken leads inevitably down to the end of the plane, with a real parliament and a real executive. There is no standing ground between the present state of things and that end and goal. For instance, one of the solutions of the Liberal Unionists was an Irish Parliament with limited powers, and the retention of the Irish members in their full strength, and for all purposes, at Westminster. We need not waste very much space in pointing out that such a solution of the question would be no solution at all. The Irish members have already shown their power at Westminster. They have turned out Ministries, upset all calculations, set all standing orders topsy-turvy, and made mince-meat of the most precious of Ministerial programmes. One would think this lesson would not have been lost upon the British Parliament, and that they would have seen that the presence of the Irish members in Westminster would have meant the final triumph of any policy on which the Irish members were united. We need scarcely say, if the legislature in Ireland were subordinate and sham, the thing the Irish party would proceed to do would be to agitate for an extension of the

powers of such a legislature. At one time they would vote with the Tories, at another with the Liberals, at all times in a body. The resistance to Home Rule would have, meantime, been almost completely emasculated by the concessions already made. The legislature in Dublin would stand behind the representatives in Westminster as the authentic mouthpiece of the wishes of the Irish people, and in this way the concession of larger powers would be a question of time, and of a very short time.

In the interval the Imperial Parliament and Imperial ministries would be once more turned topsy-turvy; the Irish question would have shadowed and absorbed all other interests, and there would be a further period of Irish discontent and English unrest. We may exaggerate the effect of good sense and of inevitable inferences upon the House of Commons, but we can scarcely think that reasoning like this would fail to have its effect, and that the House of Commons would consent to a scheme fraught with such plain and undeniable evils. If, then, Lord Randolph Churchill begins dealing with the question of Home Rule, it appears to us almost impossible that he can avoid reaching practically the same goal as was reached by Mr. Gladstone, and that thus by a more circuitous route, and by Tory instead of by Liberal hands, the Irish people may attain fulfilment of their aspirations.

In any case, the introduction of a measure of local government by the Tory Ministry must produce a very important and very beneficent change in the future of the Irish question. Home Rule will at once be removed from the region of exasperation and senseless controversy. Parties will differ, and differ strongly, as to the character of the proposals of the Government. The Irish members will in all probability be called upon to protest strongly against the schemes of Lord Randolph Churchill as neither rational, acceptable, nor durable, but all the same the question will have passed from the region of rhetoric and inflammatory Jingoism to that of sober argument. It is, very obviously, a great advance on the state of the controversy at the General Election, when even Tories are discussing whether this much Home Rule or that is desirable; and when they are only concerned as to the limits within which self-government is desirable and beyond which it would be dangerous.

Then, in the divisions which must take place upon such a Bill, it will be quite impossible for the Liberal Unionists to act together. Already many of them have "shed" a good many of their original objections to the scheme, and would now be satisfied with a control on the part of the Imperial Parliament which would be of a most shadowy character. It is scarcely probable that the whole body would be able to go consistently together throughout the long struggle on details; and when the differences between Mr. Gladstone

and Lord Randolph Churchill come down to a mere matter of detail, the Liberal Unionists who still hope to remain in the Liberal ranks will gravitate towards their old side and their old leader. It is thus possible, even if the scheme of the Government should start out as a small one, that it may be changed in committee and on the chessboard of rival factions until it has attained a width and a largeness that will make it different but in name from the proposals of Mr. Gladstone.

Meantime we have made a very important assumption. We have assumed that the Government was certain to bring in, at the beginning of the next session, a Local Government Bill. One of the reasons on which we have based this large proposition is the short speech of Lord Randolph Churchill in the House of Commons on Wednesday, the 15th of September. It is possible that these words, vague as they are, may be a small foundation for such a large edifice, and unquestionably they are words which Lord Randolph Churchill would have no very great difficulty in explaining away if self-interest so demanded; and we have no doubt that if he could he would be only too glad to adhere to his original programme, saying nothing and doing nothing, and avoiding the thorny path of Irish reform. We have no doubt, however, that there is one thing which would possibly prevent the introduction of a Local Government Bill, and that is such a state of affairs in Ireland as would compel the Government to introduce coercion. What their views of coercion are, it is impossible to say; probably they do not know themselves.

There are some who think that it is the deliberate purpose of Lord Randolph Churchill to create such a state of things in Ireland as will make coercion unavoidable, in the hope that coercion may afford an escape from concession. Coercion certainly might, for the moment, have such results. Coercion is an appeal to the brutal passions of the dominant race, and, as such, may well be calculated to excite one of those brief but fierce gusts of unreasoning passion to which the English people are subject. On the other hand, to coercive proposals the Irish members would be bound to offer opposition, which would still further inflame English opinion, and which might for a time estrange even the Liberal support; but coercion has its dangers for the Government as well as its temptations. There is no doubt that it would be violently opposed by Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party generally, and that they would exhaust nearly all the forms of the House in resisting it. We think the English people are rather sick of coercion; it is a remedy that is thoroughly discredited and odious. Besides, the strong sympathy which America and the civilized world generally has exhibited for the cause of Ireland, must have its effect

upon the English mind ; for the coercion of Ireland would excite the condemnation of every country outside England, and this would have the effect of paralyzing the English power.

At the same time, the state of affairs in Ireland is full of perils. It would be a relief to the Irish leaders, as much as to the Tory Ministry, that a Bill like that of Mr. Parnell should create a temporary truce. The inability of the tenants to pay rent can only be denied by bigoted political persons anxious to make capital out of the situation. The fall in agricultural prices has been revolutionary. In England it has produced effects under the gravity of which she would be overwhelmed if it were not that manufactures supply an outlet for the industry of so many of her people. Whole tracts of land, which a few years ago were highly rented, are falling back into the veriest wastes, because even the offer of obtaining them rent free does not afford sufficient temptation for Englishmen to enter on the now unprofitable occupation of farming. Abatements of rent have accordingly become universal ; the only difference is in their amount. Mr. Walter Morrison, one of the most bitter of the Liberal Unionists, has given his tenants as much as sixty per cent. reduction in their rents. Mr. W. H. Smith, a member of the Administration, has given his tenants an abatement of forty per cent. ; and all over England similar reductions are taking place. No one but an imbecile would argue that abatements of rent which are necessary in a rich, populous country like England, with its splendid railways, its great and innumerable markets, and its enormous manufactures, are not only necessary in Ireland with her poverty, her sparse population, her infant railway system, her few and scattered markets, and her people almost entirely dependent on agriculture. In Ireland, indeed, the case has been given up by many of the landlords themselves. Some of the most important among them, like Earl Fitzwilliam, have already given reductions of fifty per cent. ; and have thus surrendered the whole case. All that was required was legislation which would compel the evil landlord to do that which the good landlord does of his own accord.

At the moment when we write, it seems as if the Tory Government would not have the good sense to adopt this policy of reason and justice ; and the Irish farmers are left to fight their own battles without any assistance from the Imperial Exchequer. This creates a grave situation both for the farmers and for their leaders. The landlords in many parts of the country will do their utmost to exact the rent to the last farthing, irrespective of the ability of the tenant to pay. Indeed many of the landlords have little choice in the matter. Victims as well as tyrants, they have no longer any independence. Reduced to bankruptcy, their entire hold over their property is gone ; and they have no further duty than that of affixing their

names to documents presented to them by the imperious hands of the Jew or the insurance company. Thus the Earl of Kenmare for years has had no part whatever in the management of his property, but has been compelled to live on an income of two thousand pounds a year allowed him by his creditors. It is ridiculous to expect that the Irish farmers will allow themselves to be driven from their homes by their landlords for the payment of rents that every man admits to be impossible. What will take place is probably this: The tenants on the different estates will meet, and having considered all the facts of the case, will agree to ask from their landlord the abatement which the justice and the necessities of the case demand. If the landlord agree, well and good; the whole question is settled. If the landlord refuse or the persons who act in his name, then the tenants will refuse to pay any rent at all; and will meet the war that is openly proclaimed between the two sides. The National League will be bound to come to the rescue of the tenants who fight for their families and homes, and there will begin a conflict which will be war under the name of peace. It will be impossible that a campaign of this kind can be fought without many scenes of violence; without much suffering; perhaps also without some crime. Already a respected clergyman has felt it his duty to go to prison by way of testimony to the righteousness of the cause of the tenantry of which he had constituted himself a leader. In other parts of the country, other local leaders will be found ready to sacrifice themselves; and unquestionably a situation that may well be described as desperate will thus be created. It is to be hoped that the tenantry, while defending their homes, will not be betrayed into crime; which is a weapon not in their interest, but against it. Then the difficulty of the Government will begin. Either the people will overcome them, or they will overcome the people; and this seems to point inevitably towards coercion.

A revision of rents and self-government are, of course, the true escape from this *cul-de-sac*. As to revision of rents, this must further be remembered. In all proposals with regard to the land question now, the possibility of a great scheme of land purchase must always be taken into account. Beyond doubt, that is the ultimate and the early solution which the question will have to receive. But a revision of rents will have to precede a scheme of land purchase. What is taking place in Ireland at the present hour is the best proof of this. The landlords are sending round to the tenants two documents of which they may take their choice; the one a notice of eviction—the other an agreement to buy their land under a Land Purchase Act passed last year. The meaning of this is clear; the landlords are taking advantage of the pressure of a

Tory Government, of the popular depression caused by the prospect of coercion and the inability of the farmer to pay the present rent ; and utilize all these things for the purpose of forcing a bad bargain upon the tenantry. The *Daily Express*, the organ of the landlords in Dublin, revealed the whole scheme in an article it recently wrote upon Mr. Parnell's skill. No tenant, said the organ of the landlords, need be evicted if he be only reasonable. All he has to do is to consent to purchase his holding ; and at once he obtains a reduction of twenty-five per cent. in his rental. This is true ; for the purchase of the holding at once does reduce the rent from twenty-two to twenty-five per cent. under the Land Purchase Act. But it is scarcely necessary to point out that, notwithstanding, the purchase is a bad bargain if it take place on a rent that is too high ; and any purchase that takes place now must take place on a rental that is too high. Until, then, there is a new revision of rents which will bring them down to the figure demanded by the revolution in prices, all purchases of land are bad bargains ; bad alike for the Irish farmer and for the British taxpayer. These things will, of course, be brought out in debate, and will have much effect upon the English Liberals and still more upon English opinion outside. If the British masses be once convinced that the Tory Ministry are helping the Irish landlords to force bargains which will necessitate a tax upon the Imperial Exchequer, then the Ministry is undone.

Mr. Gladstone is said still to hesitate very much at reopening the settlement of 1881, and one can well understand his hesitation. Besides, he regards the question of the rent as so full of thorns that it would be very unwise of any Government to enter upon it. But the facts of the case will prove too much for his hesitation ; and we fully expect that he will soon be driven to the same position as the Irish party, and join in the demand for a revision of the rents. The Radical party, at the same time, are resolved to push the controversy from Parliament to the country ; and an active winter campaign is looked forward to. Every day brings the Liberal party closer to the opinions of the Irish members. The future, then, is well assured. There may be a short delay ; but it is the small pause in the inevitable race which in retrospect will scarcely be remembered. In the calm review of the circumstances of the struggle which we have attempted to set forth in the preceding pages no man can find any reasonable ground for feeling anything but sanguine as to the future of the Irish cause and the early triumph of Irish nationality.

WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE INDIANS?

Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii. Baltimore :
Murphy. 1886.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of
the Interior, for the year 1885.* Washington : Government
Printing Office.

THE enactments of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore concerning the better support of our Indian missions have, undoubtedly, been hailed with joy by every friend of the cause. The following is a translation of the four paragraphs (*Tit. VIII., Cap. II., 241-243*) referring to the matter :

“ Holy Mother Church has won undying honor by the history of her Missions among the aboriginal population of North America. And justly so ; for, from the time of the first discoveries in the New World to the present day, a large number of her sons, impelled by apostolic zeal and charity, have, amidst the greatest hardships, preached the gospel of the Kingdom of God to those poor brethren of ours, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and worthy of the compassionate care of Mother Church.

“ Accordingly, the Fathers decree, that the Committee (Indian Bureau), established in 1874, by his Grace the Most Reverend Archbishop of Baltimore, for the purpose of pleading the cause of the Indians with the Government, be maintained, with this modification, that it consist of four bishops, to be presided over by the Archbishop of Baltimore, and chosen, for a term of five years, by those prelates in whose dioceses Indian tribes are living. It will be the office of the Committee to locate at the Capital a priest, who shall act as Commissioner, and, in conformity with the rules to be laid down by the Committee, carefully conduct the matters enjoined on him by said prelates, and in general promote the welfare of the Indians, as opportunity may offer, and with the best means in his power.

“ In each diocese of the country collections shall be made every year, on the first Sunday in Lent, and the proceeds forwarded to the Committee for Home Missions which shall be established. The distribution will be made as follows : The amount collected on the first Sunday of Lent in those dioceses where the Society of the Pious Work of the Propagation of the Faith is already in operation, shall be employed by the Committee entirely for the support of the Indian and Negro Missions. But, in dioceses where that society is not yet introduced, the proceeds of the collection shall be equally divided, and one-half sent to Lyons, the other retained for the Indian and Negro Missions.

“ The Committee shall be established in this manner : The Most Reverend Archbishop of Baltimore will associate with himself two of those bishops whose dioceses are not in want of such aid. They will then choose for secretary a priest—say, a member of the Sulpitian Society—who shall yearly send to all the bishops an exact statement of the several collections received, and of the disposition made of the entire amount. The bishops, also, who receive a portion of those collections, will yearly inform the Committee of the number of Indians and Negroes in their dioceses, of their religious condition, and of such other matters as, in their judgment, may or must be communicated to the Committee in the interest of the cause.

“ In this whole matter, which, surely, is not devoid of difficulties, the pastors, as

well as their flocks, will find themselves greatly encouraged by the affectionate interest shown to us by His Eminence the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, who kindly expresses his readiness to furnish subsidies, as also by the indulgences granted, December 3d, 1882, by our Holy Father, Leo XIII., to certain missions, and now graciously extended to us."

If the appeal of the chief pastors meets with the hearty and generous response it deserves, and which the importance of the matter would seem to promise, a great momentum will be added to the progress of the work of conversion and civilization, begun among our Indians over three hundred years ago, and carried on with varying success, but never so promising as at the present day.

The ethnical pride of the race—in past times one of the chief obstacles to their Christianization—is, to a great extent, broken. Inter-tribal warfare has ceased. Outbreaks, or raids upon the whites, are no more to be feared. The wanton murders, once so frequently committed by a class of men, or fiends in human shape, whose motto was, "The best Indian is a dead one," are, from year to year, becoming scarcer. The prairie tribes, heretofore migratory, are, or will soon be, fixed within limits easily accessible. Most of the race are already placed in circumstances that render it well-nigh a matter of life or death for them to rely, for their support, on agriculture and other civilized pursuits. Larger numbers than ever before are not only willing, but anxious, to be instructed in the ways of the white man, including his religion.

Nor is it, as in times past, a task above the average physical strength and moral courage of man to run into the desert in quest of that stray sheep. A life of slow martyrdom, undoubtedly, still awaits the priest who devotes himself to the work of rescue; but the hardships incurred, the privations inseparable from a life of poverty and from a sojourn in more or less remote regions, the enduring patience needed for the successful performance of the Indian missionary's task, nowadays, very little differ, in many missions at least, from what every worker, in the care of souls, must be ready to brave or to practise, whether in our populous centres or among a scattered rural population. Nay, some of the difficulties and annoyances that frequently embitter the life of the latter are unknown to the laborer in the Indian mission. A particular vocation, no doubt, is required for the peculiar task; but, with such a vocation, the labor—however ungrateful it may appear at times—becomes its own reward.

One advantage, or rather an indispensable condition of complete and lasting success, utterly denied to the Franciscan and Jesuit Fathers in the heroic age of the Indian missions, and even to most of the modern pioneers, is now, or rather, with the expected suc-

cor of the faithful, will soon be, at the command of most missionaries—the inestimable help of female religious communities. The devotedness of that chosen part of Christ's flock has changed the aspect of the Indian mission, like dew of heaven falling on a parched and withering field.

Ten years ago this QUARTERLY (in its third and fourth numbers) called attention to the precarious state of some of our then existing missions in the Great Lake region, and to the pressing wants of the still larger, but practically almost abandoned, field on the western prairies. In the ears of some readers, that appeal may have sounded like a wail of despair; for it was less the lack of material aid than an apparent apathy in regard to the spiritual welfare of our red brethren, and a certain want of plan and concerted action, the writer of those articles deplored—perhaps, with too much freedom of speech. Thank God, the burning words then uttered have done no harm; nor need they be now repeated, so far at least as the field then referred to is concerned. Various causes have combined to bring about a marked change for the better; and it is chiefly the zeal and activity of the bishops whose dioceses contain portions of the aboriginal population, the ready concurrence of religious orders, both male and female, and the consequent increase in the number of laborers, that necessitate a *general* effort for the better material support of the Indian missions. Vocations, it is true, are yet far from being numerous enough for all our wants; still, the late rapid gain augurs well for the future.

To begin with the eastern portion of the territory surveyed in the articles referred to, the Ottawas, in the old mission of Little Traverse (Harbor Springs) and its dependencies, are now in charge of two Franciscan Fathers of the Recollect branch—the same order which shares the honor, with the Society of Jesus, of having been the first to visit the region of the Great Lakes. In the neighboring Crow village, two priests of the Third Order of St. Francis have been added to the missionary force; and two seculars—one of them a retired and aged bishop, doing the humble work of a pastor in a little Indian village—are stationed among the Ottawas farther south.

In Upper Michigan a new mission has just been opened for the scattered Ojibways on the shores of Lakes Huron and Michigan. In the long-established mission on Keweenaw Bay, the teaching force and the accommodations for pupils have been largely increased.

The Menominees in Wisconsin, also, have now the happiness to be under the guidance of Recollect Fathers. A large boarding-school has been put up; and one of the Fathers has given to that

tribe, who, formerly, were compelled to use books but partly intelligible to them, a prayer-book and catechism, the first works composed and printed in their language. The missionary staff consists of three priests and seven Sisters of St. Joseph.

The same Order, assisted by Franciscan Sisters and Sisters of St. Joseph, has filled the void in the Wisconsin Ojibway mission on Lake Superior. The number of Fathers engaged in it is six; of Sisters, fourteen. Here, too, one of those humble, laborious and zealous workers has added a valuable volume—a much-needed Bible history—to the religious library of that widespread tribe.¹

In Northern Minnesota, the venerable monastic order to whose labors the greater part of Europe owes its Christian civilization, has put the hand to the plough. The Ojibways of White Earth Reservation are under the paternal care of a Benedictine of the American Cassinese Congregation, while others, at Otter Tail, Winnibigoshish, Padegama and Sandy Lake, are regularly visited by a secular priest.

The most conspicuous change, however, has been wrought among the Dakotas, the dread Sioux of old. Where, ten or eleven years ago, but a single priest and a few Sisters of Charity devoted themselves to the conversion and instruction of a small portion of that great tribe, no less than five Benedictine Fathers, four secular priests and three large communities of Sisters are most successfully laboring under the guidance of a prelate who, himself the pioneer in that vast field, is intimately acquainted with all its wants. About three thousand Dakotas belong to the Church; and the fruits already reaped are but the promise of a harvest much more abundant. Nor are the Ojibways in the distant Turtle Mountain region forgotten; a secular priest has exiled himself among them.

So much concerning the field whose pressing needs were discussed in these pages ten years ago. If a proportionate increase in the number of labors and missions cannot be asserted of other fields in the West, and in the Southwest, it is at least highly gratifying to see the old established Jesuit missions in Montana, Idaho and Washington Territory remain as ever the subject of admiration and unstinted praise, on the part of the neighboring citizens and visitors from a distance, whatever their religious preferences may be. A few new missions, however, have also been opened in those regions, and in the place of four Fathers, seven or eight are now at work among the Pend d'Oreilles, Flatheads, Black Feet and Cheyennes in Montana. Quite lately one of the

¹ The book, it is true, has not yet been printed; but, with the expected assistance, it may be hoped that it will soon come out, and be in the hands of thousands of Ojibway and Ottawa readers. Most of these Indians pay for their books, but the expenses for printing and binding must be advanced by the authors.

Fathers has established himself in the Assinoboiné and Gros Ventres Reservation. The Society, also, continues its labors among the Osages and Pottawatomies in Kansas and the adjacent part of Indian Territory.

Excellent progress, especially in the education of the young, is reported from Oregon. Three secular priests, assisted by Sisters of Mercy and Benedictine Nuns, are engaged in the Indian missions of that State, on the Umatilla and Grande Ronde Reservations.

The meagreness of reports from other western fields renders it impossible to give due credit to the zeal of all the prelates and the regular or secular clergy entrusted with Indian charges, and to the devotedness of their assistants, the members of female religious congregations or orders.

The mission in Indian Territory, confided since 1876 to Benedictines of the French Cassinese Congregation, appears to labor under peculiar difficulties, and partly still relies on the visits of missionaries from neighboring dioceses. Thus far, two schools, directed by Benedictine Fathers and Sisters of Mercy, are in operation.

The reports from New Mexico show a slight increase in the number of Pueblo chapels. For a dozen missions, however, but two or three priests could thus far be spared.

A singular fact—apt to put to shame the stronger sex—is reported from Arizona. Under that sultry sun a brave band of Sisters of St. Joseph, as yet unassisted by a resident priest,¹ have taken charge of the savage Yuma tribe, as teachers and local agents for the Government.

A remnant of Catholic Choctaws, in the State of Mississippi, has been lately, as it were, discovered, and provided with schools, one of them kept by Sisters of Mercy. A secular priest, fresh from Europe—which, indeed, thus far has furnished all our Indian missionaries, with hardly an exception—has made one of their villages his happy home.²

In the Northeast, the long-converted Abenakis have had the happiness, within the last decade, to see their children placed under the tuition of religious women. Eleven Sisters of Mercy conduct three schools in that section.

Finally, in what is now our true Northwest, we have just beheld a bishop, accompanied by four members of the Society of Jesus, enter the pathless wilds, to build up a mission on the Upper Yukon, where he already once before spent a dreary winter among the

¹ Since the above was written, one of the Recollect Fathers of the Wisconsin Ojibway mission has gone to fill the void.

² No mention is made of these Indians in the "Report of the Commissioner," etc. Some other small bands are also overlooked in the official census.

Alaskan hordes. Two secular priests are stationed on the Pacific coast.

If many items of progress, as is most likely, be found wanting in this rapid survey, the blame will partly fall on the good missionaries themselves, who love to labor in obscurity. They will be the last to complain of being slighted. But will it not be in the interest of the Indian missions if one of those engaged in it snatch an occasional hour from their ordinary duties, to let the public know something of their joys and their troubles, their wants and their hopes? The regular issue of missionary letters—a continuation of the Jesuit *Relations* and *Lettres Edifiantes*—would certainly rouse a more general and practical interest in the cause, and could hardly fail to stimulate vocations.¹

¹ The "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs" for 1885 contains numerous testimonials, highly commendatory of the labors of our Indian missionaries. A few samples will be found interesting :

" Devils' Lake Agency, Fort Totten, Dakota.

"The majority of the Indians on this reservation are Catholic. The baptismal record shows 900 baptisms since the establishment of the mission, and 112 during the last year. Rev. Jerome Hunt, of the Order of St. Benedict, who speaks the Indian language fluently, is working a wonderful change amongst these people by his untiring zeal and eloquent instructions. Since his connection with the mission (three years), eighty-three marriages have been publicly solemnized in the Church, in the presence of the congregation, during divine service, and the contracting parties fully understand that death only can relieve them from their obligations, and that under no condition can they 'throw away a wife and take another.'

"The Industrial Boarding-School for Boys and Girls is conducted, under contract, by the Gray Nuns of Montreal, and has been under their management since 1874. . . . There was an average attendance at this school during the year of 61 scholars, boys and girls, who are as far advanced in their studies as boys and girls of similar ages in the States, and reflect much credit upon the Sisters and all employees connected with the school.

"MORALS.—I challenge a comparison in this respect with any community in the States, of the same size, and venture the assurance that the odds will be largely in favor of these Indians. . . .

"JOHN W. CRAMSIE,
Agent."

" Grande Ronde Agency, Oregon.

"The missionary work at this agency is still, as it has been for the last twenty-four years, under the supervision of the Reverend Father Croquet. The reverend Father is an old pioneer priest, who has spent all his time without compensation, and frequently without food and shelter, other than that furnished him by the Indians, while making his annual pastoral visits to the people of his faith, many of whom reside on the Siletz Agency, and at other points on the coast.

"T. B. SINNOTT,
Agent."

" Umatilla Agency, Oregon.

"The boarding-school, established here in 1882, is progressing well. At the exercises, held on June 26th last, at which Bishop Gross, the Archbishop of Oregon, and all the prominent persons in Pendleton and vicinity, were present, every one expressed themselves as not only highly pleased but astonished at the progress made by

All these missions, then, need help. Priests and Sisters must live. In some places, even the outfit for divine worship is incom-

the pupils. There are now 75 pupils who attend, all of them well fed, clothed, and well taken care of in all respects, owing to the more than liberal munificence of the Government. The buildings, outhouses and grounds, belonging to the school, are kept in excellent order, and the teachers and other employees are all that can be desired. The school-farm contains about 65 acres, and the industrial teacher, with the help of the older boys, had cut and stacked 25 tons of as fine wheat-hay as any in the country; in addition, an ample supply of vegetables of all kinds has been raised on the farm, and sufficient seeds are saved for planting purposes next season. The school is a credit to the Government and all concerned, the scholars are well behaved and love (as they have good reason) their teachers.

"E. J. SOMMERVILLE,
Agent."

"Colville Indian Agency, Washington Territory.

"The schools of this agency number four—two at Cœur d'Alène and two at the Colville Mission—under contract with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions. They are all industrial boarding-schools, and are faithfully taught by the Fathers of the Jesuit faith and the noble Sisters of Charity. They are all in a flourishing condition, and the outlook for the future is very bright for them. A new school building, at the Colville girls' school, has been finished, and is now ready for occupancy. These school buildings are built entirely at the expense of the mission, and the pupils are maintained (board, clothes and tuition), at an expense to the Government of only \$108 per year for each pupil. This compensation is wholly inadequate to maintain these pupils, and, were it not for the means derived from other sources by the mission, they could not possibly be cared for at the present rate. They should, at least, be allowed \$150 per annum, which is much less than what it costs to support pupils in Government schools not under contract.

"The same earnest zeal for the welfare of the Indians, wherever dispersed, has characterized the labors of the Jesuit Fathers during the past year. Night or day, in summer's heat or winter's cold, they are ready at the call of the Master above—ready to do their duty, without the hope of fee or reward. Their influence has been great with the Indian tribes of the Northwest, in preserving peaceful relations between the Indians and the whites. May they ever remain among the Indians of this agency, is my earnest and heartfelt prayer. The noble, self-sacrificing Sisters of Charity, who are in charge of the girls' school at Cœur d'Alène and at Colville, have been severely taxed in their efforts to erect school buildings at both places; but they have succeeded in having two very fine buildings built for the better accommodation of their pupils. They are sowing seed among these children, which will bear much fruit in after-life.

"SIDNEY D. WATERS,
United States Indian Agent,"

The following is found in the "Report of the Sub-committee of the Special Committee of the United States Senate," appointed to visit the Indian tribes in Northern Montana in 1883. It refers to the *Jesuit Mission of St. Ignatius among the Flatheads*.

"The schools have now 100 scholars, about equally divided between the two sexes, and the Government pays \$100 annually for the board, tuition, and clothing of each scholar, to the number of 80. The boys and girls are in separate houses, the former under a corps of five teachers (three Fathers and two lay-brothers), and the girls under three Sisters and two half-Sisters, Father Van Gorp being at the head of the institution. The children are taught reading and writing, arithmetic, grammar and geography, and the recitations, all in the English language, are equal to those of the white children in the States, of the same age. The mission has a saw and grist mill and planing and shingle machine, worked by the boys, several hundred head of cattle and horses, and 300 acres of land belonging to the mission, cultivated successfully by the male scholars, the product being sufficient to furnish enough wheat and oats and vegetables

plete, or lamentably poor. The missionaries have to build their own houses and chapels; and, where the Government day-schools are used for proselytizing purposes, also the schoolhouses. Boarding-schools should be established wherever practicable, and those already existing improved and enlarged. Much remains to be done in this respect, especially for the male youth. Besides, a number of new missions ought to be erected among pagan tribes, as well as in abandoned old fields, where poorly instructed Catholics are in danger of relapsing into superstition, or becoming estranged from the faith by the exertions of non-Catholic agents and teachers.

But, after all this will have been made known to our people, some will yet be inclined to ask questions. Even among the overburdened clergy, a few may be tempted to demur. The faithful, it will be said, have to provide for so many pressing needs of their own. Will their alms produce fruit sufficiently abundant to justify the additional effort now demanded of them? Is not the whole Indian race doomed to extinction? And will not all attempts to civilize the red man produce, as heretofore, but meagre results, or end in complete failure?

There is but one answer to these questions: *Our Indians will live and be civilized.*

To be more explicit, a few of the smaller tribes, or fragments of tribes, will probably disappear without a trace. A larger number may live on, indefinitely, in their present strength, or with a slight increase. The bulk of our Indians will, indeed, sooner or later cease to exist *as a distinct race*; but their hybrid descendants—finally to be absorbed, with the rest of our heterogeneous population, in the great North American people—will, in ever-increasing numbers, form a comparatively small, but by no means unimportant percentage of our general population.

As to civilization, the culture of full-blood individuals and separate communities will, indeed, never be that of the white race. But

for all purposes. The girls are also taught by the Sisters, besides the branches we have mentioned, music, sewing, embroidery and housekeeping. For a time the school was only for females, and the result was, that the young women, after being educated, married ignorant half-breeds or Indians, and, unable to withstand the ridicule of their companions, relapsed into a barbarism worse, if possible, than that of husband and tribe. Now, after the establishment of the department for males, the young people, when they leave school, intermarry, and each couple becomes a nucleus for civilization and religion in the neighborhood where they make their home, the Fathers and agent assisting them in building a house and preparing their little farm for raising a crop. We cannot sufficiently commend this admirable school, and we do not envy the man who can see only a mercenary object or any but the highest and purest motives which can actuate humanity in the self-sacrificing devotion of the noble men and women, fitted by talents and accomplishments of the highest order to adorn any walk in life, who are devoting their lives to the education of these Indian children."

the red man is not an irredeemable savage; and the experience gained by former failures, the increased facilities and better means at the command of those engaged in the work, and the more general and growing sympathy with the "wards of the nation," are a sure promise of a rapid and solid improvement in their social state and general culture. The ultimate civilization of that large portion of the race which will be absorbed by the white population is, of course, but a question of time.

Finally, if the future of our Indians from the religious point of view be put to question, it may be safely asserted that large numbers will soon be weaned from heathen belief and practices by the combined exertions of our civil government and the various denominations engaged in the mission; but how many of them and their descendants, down to the remotest ages, will have the happiness to live and die as members of the mystical body of Christ, will depend on the fidelity with which we shall acquit ourselves of our duty, and, consequently, to a large extent, on the response our people are going to make to the appeal of their chief pastors for the support of the Indian missions.

The several assertions included in the above general answer must be subjected to a more detailed consideration.

I.

The question as to the vitality of the North American Indians has been brought a long step nearer its solution by the critical study of all available documents relating to the distribution and numerical strength of the tribes east of the Mississippi and south the St. Lawrence and the great lakes, before the middle of the 16th century.¹ In the place of the many millions of the popular belief, that Indian population was found to have been below 180,000 souls. Under the operation of accidental causes, not likely to occur again on a large scale—such as wars, both inter-tribal and with the whites, wanton slaughter, wide-spread diseases, migrations, and forced removals—their descendants had, towards the middle of the present century, been reduced to about 120,000 souls. From that period to this day they have, on the whole, been steadily gaining; and the same holds good of the bulk of western Indians not included in the above calculation.²

¹ The Former and Present Number of our Indians, by Brevet Lieut.-Col. Garrick Mallory.

² According to the "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs" for 1885, the Indian population in the United States, exclusive of Alaska, amounts to 259,244, while in 1880 it was 256,127, showing the trifling gain of 3117 souls in five years. And even this slight increase would appear to have been anything but steady. The report of 1881 shows a gain of 5724, that of the following year a loss of 2219; in 1883 there appears another gain of 5933; in 1884 a loss of 1565; in 1885, of 4756.

Now, all this looks very suspicious; and so does the fact that *over one-half* of the

The number of tribes, or disjointed and isolated fragments of tribes, whose absolute extinction in the near future appears probable, is insignificant, and favorable circumstances may yet save some of them. The chief causes of their steady decrease are partly moral degradation and hereditary taints, partly frequent inter-marriage of near relatives—the consequence of their isolated position and small numbers. On the whole, the Indians are not an unprolific race; but their habits of life, even in the more advanced stages of culture, are not favorable to rapid increase. Hence, any additional causes tending to lessen the number of births, or to heighten the death-rate, are apt to bring about a stand-still, or a retrogressive motion, as to numbers. But those causes being removed, the case will be reversed. Thus, moral improvement through the means of healthy religious influences, and intermarriage with individuals of other tribes, or with whites, may in the case of some of the declining tribes yet become the means of arresting the downward course. Whether such a result be desirable or not, from the point of view of national economy, is of little concern in our present inquiry. Those poor people stand in need of succor as much as the healthier and more prosperous tribes, and no diffi-

last great loss (4756) occurred *in a single agency*. According to the returns of the last six years, the Cheyennes and Arapahoes, in Indian Territory, numbered respectively 5899, 6455, 6569, 6496, 6271, and 3609 souls. The loss of 2662 souls in one year—43 per cent.—without any extraordinary cause to account for it, exceeds the limit of credibility. At this rate, that agency would become a sinecure in a very few years. The medical statistics of those two tribes show but 222 deaths, or $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the same year.

Similar suspicious figures occur in the census of the Assinoboines and Gros Ventres of Fort Belknap Agency, Montana, who numbered 2150 souls in 1884, and but 1552 in 1885, a loss of 28 per cent.; and in the census of the Yankton Sioux, of Fort Peck Agency, Montana, who were reduced from 3542, in 1884, to 2332, in 1885, losing 34 per cent. in a year of comparatively good health. The medical statistics of these two agencies show a loss by death of, respectively, but 50 and 77 souls, in the same year. Another statistical freak occurs in the tables referring to progress in civilization, etc. In these the number of Indians (exclusive of the "nations" in Indian Territory) who could read in 1882 is stated to have been 14,532. In the following year there were but 14,399 such scholars; and this, in spite of the fact that 1889 individuals had learned to read within those twelve months. To explain this puzzle, we should assume that out of 16,421 Indian readers as many as 2022 died in one year,—12 per cent.—an impossible death-rate for persons above at least six years, as they all must have been. In 1884 there were, again, 18,185 readers, a gain of 3786; and still we are informed that the number of those who *learned* to read within that year was but 2257.

The cause of most of these statistical absurdities is, in all likelihood, the manner in which many of the agents prepare their yearly returns. Instead of making an actual count, the number of births, deaths and other items, more or less carefully ascertained is added to (or deducted from) the figures of each preceding year, though primarily these figures may have been mere estimates or based on incorrect enumerations, or on fraudulent returns. As soon, then, as an honest census is taken, such strange discrepancies as those pointed out above make their appearance. Such a census appears to have been, in many agencies, that of 1885. Hence the decrease of the Indian population in that year may safely be assumed to be merely apparent.

culty should make us shrink from attempting their spiritual rescue. Has not the Church ever shown a mother's heart in her dealings with the poor and miserable, and most despised of the world?

Among the tribes whose statistics show a stationary condition or a slow increase, a certain number located in regions not likely soon, or ever, to attract white settlers,—such, for instance, as large portions of Alaska and Arizona,—have a fair prospect to continue as a distinct race for centuries to come. Let them be brought under the fostering care of the Church, and they will be as happy people as any on earth,—poor, of little account in the great material concerns of the nation, but oases of peace and contentment. And many a bright soul will wing her way up out of the wilderness, thanking her distant brethren for the helping hand. The sooner, then, we enter upon such ground, the better for those Indians and the more creditable to the children of the Church in this country.

The larger number of our Indians, however, belong to that portion of the race which, after the lapse of centuries, will exist but in the person of their hybrid descendants. This will be the fate of all those tribes that own valuable land, or live in close proximity to neighborhoods adapted to agriculture or other industries. Within a few decades most of them will be—as many already are—scattered among, or surrounded on all sides by, permanent white settlers. Intermarriages will become more frequent, and illicit intercourse, alas, will hardly anywhere be entirely wanting. There are already some neighborhoods and smaller tribes where scarcely a full-blood individual can be found. Among others the mixed-bloods form a considerable majority. Wherever the above-mentioned conditions exist, we see the process of amalgamation going on with more or less rapidity, and it is strange that this fact has been so little adverted to by writers on the "Indian problem."

In the "struggle for existence" that will ensue wherever that crowding of the races will take place, a large number of full-bloods, and even many of their immediate descendants, must succumb. The *ratio* of decimation will depend on causes beyond present calculation, such as the greater or lesser wisdom of governmental measures for the protection of the Indians, and the degree of faithfulness, on the part of subaltern officers, in executing them; the character of the religious bodies laboring for their conversion; the morals and more or less friendly disposition of their white neighbors. The innate capabilities of the divers tribes, and the degree of culture acquired by them when the struggle begins, will, of course, also greatly modify the result. Some tribes, or portions of tribes, will fare worse than others. Some of the smaller may disappear, leaving hardly a trace; but of all the larger ones full-blood

representatives, though in ever-decreasing numbers, will be seen among us, perhaps for centuries to come. Their mixed-blood descendants will, for a still longer time, form a more or less perceptible element of population in those sections of the country where the larger tribes are now, or will soon be, permanently located,—until the day comes when the physical and intellectual traits of their Indian ancestors will become all but obliterated, and when some of the most prominent men of the nation will boast of the Cherokee, or Dakota, or Ojibway blood that runs in their veins.¹

¹ The subjoined table will show to what extent the process of absorption has already gone on in some of the tribes or fragments of tribes.

Name of Tribe.	Full Bloods.	Mixed Bloods.	Percentage of Mixed Bloods. (The decimals are neglected.)
Wyandotte, Quapaw Agency, I. T., . . .	12	251	95
Ottawa, " " . . .	7	110	94
Seneca, " " . . .	50	189	79
Turtle Mountain Chippewa, Dakota, . . .	183	731	79
Chippewa and Ottawa, Michigan, . . .	3800	5700	60
Iroquois, New York, . . .	2890	2080	58
Stockbridge and Menominee, Wisconsin, . . .	667	774	53
Chippewa in Wisconsin and Minnesota, . . .	2409	1247	34
Chippewa, Munsee, Iowa, . . .	661	305	31
Kikapoo, Pottawatomie, Sac and Fox, of Great Nemaha Agency, Kansas, . . .			
Osage, Kaw, and Quapaw, Osage Ag., I. T., . . .	1464	433	22
Omaha and Winnebago, Om. and Win. Agency, Nebraska, . . .	1952	550	22
Walla Walla, Cayuse, and Umatilla, Oregon, . . .	730	166	18
Flatheads, Kootenais, and Pends d'Oreille, Montana, . . .	1816	250	13
	16,641	12,786	43

At the head of this list, it will be perceived, stand the descendants of the Huron clan (Wyandotte, Wendat, Tionontate) which, *with about the same numbers*, formed Father Marquette's congregation in Michilimackinac (1671-73), and remained there till the beginning of the last century, when they went to Detroit, and afterwards to Sandusky, from whence they were moved to Indian Territory. The first intermixture with whites may have occurred over two hundred years ago. During their stay on Detroit River and Sandusky Bay, a number of their daughters undoubtedly became members of white families who did not follow them to their last retreat, and whose descendants are now probably living in Canada, Michigan and Ohio. The twelve surviving full-blood representatives of the tribe are most likely old persons, and at the end of this century not one of them may be left. Thus the history of that remarkable little clan may be considered as typical of the fate of a great part of the Indian race in the United States.

The Ottawas and Chippewas (Ojibwa, Ojibway) have also been more or less in contact with whites for over two hundred years, especially in Upper Michigan and the neighboring part of Canada, where the percentage of mixed bloods is probably up to 90. The hybrid portion of these two (nearly related) tribes far outnumbers their full-blood ancestors of 200 years ago, and in some neighborhoods the *ratio* of their increase is little below that of the whites. The assertion of their agent (in Michigan) that in 50 years the race will be extinct, can only be understood as referring to the full-blood portion, and even in regard to them it is a great exaggeration.

The material civilization of these dissolving tribes will, of course, take care of itself. It will be that of their surroundings, more or less. But what of their Christian civilization? What will be the fate of so many thousands of souls, capable, as we are, of the supernatural union with God through Christ? That will, in a great measure, depend on the religious or irreligious influences which may be brought to bear on the present rude, but simple and pliant race,—influences that are likely to determine the fate of their most distant descendants.

Our responsibility, from this point of view, is evident. The salvation of hundreds of thousands of souls is, in a manner, placed in our hands. Unborn millions appeal to our charity, as did once the children of Erin in the vision of a certain "holy youth." The question, then, can only be: Will Indians ever become true Christians? Utter barbarians are incapable of leading a Christian life. As grace presupposes nature, so grace unfolding in a godly life presupposes a normally developed nature. Is the full blood-Indian capable of such development? This question brings us to the second part of our inquiry.

II.

Is the Indian race capable of civilization? An unqualified answer, whether in the affirmative or in the negative, is fraught with practical danger. If you recognize no civilization besides that of the white man, or the Anglo-Saxon, our red brethren will forever remain out of its pale. Any attempt to raise a community of full-blood Indians, or even their immediate half-caste descendants, upon that high level, will prove a failure, if not a positive injury to them. Still, the Indians, like every other inferior race, are capable of civilization, that is, a civilization of their own. There are certain physical and mental race characteristics which, in the ordinary course of nature, will never be lost or transcended. Thus the civilization of even so nearly related races as the several members of the so-called Indo-European family is not, and will never be, exactly the same. With the red man the case is worse. He is not merely dissimilar, or standing on a different, though equally elevated, plane; the Indian is not by any means the equal of the white man, either intellectually or physically. You may educate picked individuals to the semblance of cultured white men and women of ordinary ability, and hold them up as a living demonstration of the capacity of the race; and in a certain sense you are right; the Indian is not a savage inaccessible to culture and refinement, such as he has been portrayed by some writers. But let those Europeanized or Americanized Indians be placed on their own feet, whether singly or as a community, and they will fail to achieve what whites, similarly educated and circumstanced, would

be likely to accomplish. Their inbred defects, such as slowness of thought, want of mental energy and grasp, incapacity of persistent effort, lack of self-reliance, inability to grapple with complicated problems, and more or less indolence, will prevent them from making an efficient use of their accomplishments.

Educated Indians left to shift for themselves will, under favorable circumstances, fare as the vegetables of our gardens when remanded to the freedom of nature. Under untoward circumstances their fate will be that of tropical plants exposed to the rigor of an unwonted climate. When placed in the lists with white competitors of average ability, the best trained Indians will soon be left behind in the race; and if those competitors happen to be as much their inferiors in honesty as they excel them in shrewdness and persistency—a case of not unfrequent occurrence—the poor Indians will soon be driven to the wall, crushed, and ground to powder. And thus the proof will be furnished that the race is incapable of civilization.

The so-called civilized tribes or “nations” in the Indian Territory form no proof to the contrary. The work, both bodily and mental, which, in that exceptionally favored region, keeps up the semblance of American civilization, is chiefly done by whites, and to some extent by mixed-bloods; and proportionately with the increase of the latter, the full-blood Indians are losing ground, and will eventually disappear, as in other sections of the country.¹

¹ “The Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Seminoles, composing this agency, it is estimated, number about 65,000, *including white and colored adopted citizens. The number of full-blood Indians is decreasing*, while the increased number of mixed-bloods, and the adopted white and colored citizens make the population about the same from year to year. The number of whites is increasing. The cause of this increase is, that the work done in the country is by whites, and not by Indians. *The mixed bloods will work some, but the full-bloods hardly ever.* Under the laws of the country a citizen is entitled to all the land he may have improved. An arrangement is easily made with a white man who will make a farm for an Indian and give him a portion of the crops for the use of his name, and after a few years give him possession of the farm. Thus it is that more farms mean more white men. The number of whites within this agency who are laborers for Indians, employes of railroad companies, licensed traders, pleasure-seekers, travellers, and intruders, must be about 35,000, or half the number of Indians.” “Report of the Commissioners,” etc., for 1884, p. 98. Evidently the very excellency of their land is one of the causes of the decrease of the full-blood population; idle people will not thrive.

“The citizens of the nation are composed of many classes and grades. The Cherokee nation will illustrate the other nations. Her citizens are full-blood Cherokees; half-blood Cherokees to one-sixty-fourth Cherokees and white stock; Cherokee crossed on Creek, on Choctaw, on Chickasaw, etc., and on the African stock; adopted citizens of the Cherokee nation—full-blood Shawnees, full-blood Delawares, full-blood Creeks, *full-blood white men*, full-blood African, and the same stock variously blended with Cherokees and with other races, including Creeks, Choctaws, Osages, Chickasaws. The much larger part of the nation is of Cherokee blood, about 8000 full-blood, and 8000 mixed-blood Cherokees, and about 5000 of the other races mentioned.” From the report of the agent in “Report of the Commissioner,” etc., for 1885. (The italics are ours.)

Indians are, with rare exceptions, but indifferent brain-workers. They are easily fatigued and diverted from the business in hand, and need more rest than most white men. Hence, though able and, if properly encouraged, also willing to work, they must not be expected to do the work of the stronger and more highly gifted race. They are, as compared with us, mere children, and must be treated as children. This is the shortest expression of the experience gained with them by half a century of all sorts of trials, well-meant but ill-devised experiments, partial successes, and numerous failures. If treated on that principle, with the benevolence, firmness, unremittent care and patience needed in the treatment of children, the remnants of the race in the United States, and their descendants, may yet be elevated to a state of comparative prosperity. They must never be presumed to have outgrown the need of the leading strings. As long as there are Indians in the country, we shall have wards, and as a nation we should be thankful for the fact; for much remains to be done to redeem the national honor, and make amends for the sins committed, whether through lack of wisdom or from want of love, against the original occupants of our magnificent domain.

In this respect it is encouraging to see the gradual improvement in the relations between the Government and its Indian ward. In the earlier part of the century we treated the red man as an incorrigible savage, unfit to enjoy life in the close neighborhood of the superior race, who needed his fertile lands. If unwilling to go at our bidding, we removed the tribes by force. This, of course, simply postponed the solution of the problem. Civilization followed the Indians apace, and on our westward march we met still others whom we had hardly known by name. The system of removal, it was clear, could not be kept up indefinitely. Thus came the period of purchases and treaties; and with strange inconsistency we began to deal with those savages as if they were not merely our equals, but rather our superiors in intellect, experience, and readiness of adaptation to unwonted circumstances. We put gold in their hands, we gave them ploughs, we sent them teachers. With our money we fostered their gambling propensities, their improvidence, their idleness, their love of drink. Grown up in *their* habits, would *we* have done better? Our agricultural tools were of as much use to most of them as they would be to the white trapper or fisherman. As long as people are able to make both ends meet and provide for their accustomed wants, by following an easy and congenial trade, they will hardly embroil themselves with what they believe, or upon a short trial actually find, to be more irksome and for the unskilled also less profitable. The Government's *employé*, it is true, was there to show them the use of the imple-

ments and the beauty of farming. Was not his an enviable position, and apt to stimulate the ambition of his savage pupils? Indeed it was; and few of those savages would have refused to take his place, with a handsome salary to live upon and paid help to do most of the work. But the schoolmaster? Did not he at least faithfully labor to enlighten the budding minds of the rising generation? Imagine a third or fourth-rate Chinese pedagogue, ignorant of the first word of English, sent from Canton to San Francisco, to imbue its street Arabs with the wisdom of Confucius, and let him to that end teach Mandarin Chinese, a few hours a day, to small and irregular audiences, his success will be about on a par with that of many of our Indian teachers within the last thirty or forty years.

Had the Indians become civilized by the methods so long employed by the Government, that very fact would prove them our very superiors in natural endowment and quickness of adaptation. But having profited so little by the money most injudiciously distributed among them in return for their land, and by all the care bestowed upon them in accordance with unwise treaties, they again became, in the public opinion, the incorrigible sluggards and irredeemable savages of yore.

Fortunately, this is but one side of the picture. All has not been failure. Among the agents of the Government, some were fit for the position, honest, kindly disposed, men of judgment and energy. With the red man's almost intuitive knowledge of character, the charges of such agents soon learned to esteem and trust them, and with their advice and efficient aid, made considerable progress in agriculture and other civilized pursuits. In some sections the neighborhood of a better class of white settlers also operated as a stimulus. Nor did all the whites that here and there intermarried with the tribes belong to that despicable class of "squaw men" whose chief business appears to be to teach the Indians all the vices of the white man, with none of his good qualities. Of the influence exerted by a part, at least, of the missionaries, it is needless to speak. The progress thus made by a goodly number of individuals and families in many of the tribes showed both the capacity of the race for culture, and the conditions on which success depends.

With regard to the instruction of the Indian youth, light has also gradually dawned upon the minds of our agents, commissioners, and legislators. A little spelling, reading, and writing in a tongue utterly unintelligible or imperfectly understood, is no longer expected to neutralize the education of the wigwam or the tipi; nor is the most strongly-expressed desire of Indian parents to see their children grow up in the ways of the white man, believed to work as a charm and enable them to impart to their off-

spring what they do not possess themselves. Hence the Government has, in imitation of the system inaugurated by the Jesuit Fathers, established a number of boarding-schools—"reservation boarding-schools,"—and "training-schools" at a distance from the tribes. And as it became understood that Indians must be civilized by labor, not by books, the instruction in agriculture, trades, and domestic work has been placed in the foreground, while the other studies are greatly facilitated by the pupils finding themselves in constant contact with English-speaking persons. In many day schools, too, industrial and agricultural lessons have been added to the other branches to the extent of making some of them partly self-supporting. The really surprising achievements of many of the children and young men and women—partly taken from the wildest tribes—being witnessed by numerous visitors and attested by the press, are beginning to create a more favorable public opinion; and we may look forth, in the near future, for a great extension of the boarding and training-school system. A certain percentage of the educated youth, returning among tribes still unfit to value their accomplishments and profit by them, will be apt to suffer shipwreck; others will do but little towards the elevation of their less-favored brethren. Still, on the whole, the system will work well as far as material civilization is concerned; it will hasten the culture of the tribes and their manifest destiny—the mingling of the races.

Another error in our dealing with the Indians, which here and there has done great harm, is also happily becoming more and more recognized by all disinterested advisers of the Administration. This is the belief that Indians having reached a certain degree of civilization may safely be allowed the rights of American citizens in regard to the alienation of property; that is, of their individual shares of the tribal allotments. Unless protected by stringent laws, almost every Indian holder of valuable real estate will be turned out of house and farm as soon as his property becomes a tempting morsel for the cupidity of the white man. While marketable land remains in his hands he will be tempted to accept advances on it. This enables him to follow his bent for idleness and drink, and, having lost the last acre, the poor, demoralized wretch will almost invariably find himself reduced to the condition of a vagabond and a beggar. The Indian—it cannot be too much emphasized—is and remains a child as compared with the white man, and in the midst of the stronger but by no means implacable race, can hold no other position but that of a ward of the Government, which alone is able to protect him against himself and the cupidity of his white neighbors. Hence it is encouraging to see that the Administration, though inclined to allow the individual

members of tribes land in severalty, is becoming more and more reluctant to grant them land in fee simple. If this condition, as may be hoped, be strictly adhered to, a strong check will be placed against the degradation of tribes that own valuable land, large numbers of Indians will become agriculturists, their extinction will be indefinitely postponed, and the result of the gradual absorption, wherever it is to take place, will be a healthier and altogether better stock of mixed bloods.

The measure referred to, of allotting land in severalty, if carried out as far as practicable, will tend to put an end to the system of massing large, inactive bodies and furnishing them a living off-hand,—a system excusable, nay, necessary, as a temporary measure, in the case of removals and in consequence of the extinction of game, but always injurious to the moral and physical health of its victims, and, if kept up for years, absolutely ruinous. In this regard it is a pleasure to read the reports of some agents, contrasting the state of farming and partly or wholly self-supporting Indians with that of their herded and fed brethren. These reports—with some allowance here and there to be made for exaggerations—would, if more generally known, go far to dispel the widespread prejudice regarding the incapacity of the race for any respectable degree of civilization.

Other signs of improvement in the management of the Reservation Indians are the more decided and energetic action taken by the better class of agents against gambling, against certain dances,—such as the Dakota sun-dance,—and similar exciting and barbarous customs; the prohibition, wherever practical, of polygamy, and the establishment of Indian police and native courts for the prevention and punishment of crimes and misdemeanors. Most agents cheerfully attest the goodwill and intelligence with which the tribes, even the very rudest, have availed themselves of those institutions for their social improvement.¹

¹ The following testimonials by Indian agents (in "Report of the Commissioner," etc.) will surprise many a reader:

Mohaves and Chemihueves.

"They are peaceably disposed. No fighting or quarreling has come to my knowledge, and I have not had occasion to reprimand any for disorderly conduct. Sobriety is universal among these Indians; no cases of larceny. My orders have been obeyed with promptness and apparently without reluctance." (p. 1.)

Pimas.

"A better class of children to train and teach could hardly be found. . . . Once in school the children are tractable, interested, not more indolent than white children, and the desire to learn and improve constantly increases." (p. 3.)

Dakotas (Crow Creek Agency).

"The children are remarkably docile and gentle, learn readily, and make progress satisfactorily." (p. 21.)

We now arrive at the most important question, the religious. On this field, too, failures—partial, at least—have been so frequent that in the eyes of many, even well-disposed persons, the very history of the Indian missions would seem to prove the hopeless degradation of the tribes or the utter incapacity of the race for true Christian civilization. To examine the causes of that indifferent success, as far as it may have been depending upon defective doctrine and upon the want of capacity and disinterestedness on the part of the religious teachers, lies beyond the scope of the present discussion. It is our own experience on this field that chiefly concerns us, and there we meet with the fact that wherever the Church, *especially as represented by her religious orders*, has been allowed to bring to bear her full and untrammelled action upon any of the

(Fort Berthold Agency.)

"The conduct of the Indians on this Reservation for the past year has been, indeed, remarkable. I am sure there is not, nor could there be produced, a band of so many whites among whom so little crime has been committed." (p. 29.)

Crows.

"I am pleased to be able to commend the Crows for being a temperate people. There are but few who are fond of strong drink. Some of the young men may be worse when absent from the Reservation than they are at home, but I have only found it necessary to punish Indians in two instances in nearly four years for being intoxicated or for having intoxicating liquors in their possession. This is not because they could not get it. They can get all they want at any time. But they have no desire for it." (p. 123.)

Cœur d'Alènes.

"The Cœur d'Alènes, on the Cœur d'Alène Reserve, in Idaho, are flourishing in the highest degree, being wholly independent of the Government save in the support of their schools and the instruction they receive from their farmer. . . . Some half dozen of them have two hundred acres of land under cultivation already." (p. 183.)

From the "Report," etc., of 1884 :

Dakotas (Devil's Lake Agency).

"The Indians are very anxious to know if the Great Father intends to purchase their wheat again this year for making flour to feed the Chippewas. The Sioux and Chippewas have been enemies from time immemorial until a few years ago, and the Sioux feel proud that they are now able to raise grain to feed their old enemies, and often speak of it. They informed Inspector Gardner, when here a short time ago, in proof of their civilization and advancement, that 'instead of going on the war path to procure Chippewa scalps, we stay at home and till the soil, and furnish, from our surplus, bread for the Chippewas, for we are instructed by our missionaries of the black gown to forgive our enemies and love one another, so you can see with your own eyes that we are farmers and trying to be Christians also.' " (p. 31.)

(Yankton Agency.)

"As among white men, all are not good, but I unhesitatingly say, based upon close observation and daily contact with them, that there are less idle, worthless men among them than are found in one of our villages of equal population. Some of my Indian farmers have inspired me with great respect. In personal dress and appearance, as also in good sense and pleasant manners, they are the equal of some of our prominent Western white farmers." (p. 60.)

tribes, and *where the proper methods were employed*, the most consoling results have been obtained. It is in regard to the method, chiefly, that mistakes have been made, and with the experience gained by those errors we shall be able, God helping, to prosecute the work with increasing success. A particular instance will not be out of place as an illustration.

About thirty years ago an aged missionary knelt before the altar of the chapel in which he had baptized and instructed several hundred Indians once steeped in vice and heathenish superstition. After ten years of apparently most successful labor he had been obliged to leave his little flock, and those new Christians had now for two years been partly deprived of spiritual succor, partly under incompetent guidance. Being once more among his children, who filled the chapel, the old father began to recite for them the accustomed morning-prayers; but soon his sonorous voice became husky, his breast began to heave, his tongue to falter. With a powerful effort that strong-nerved man strove to subdue an emotion entirely unusual with him on such occasions. He partly succeeded in suppressing the outward signs of his high-wrought feelings, but the whole prayer was a combat with sobs, and we all felt relieved when the end came. What had thus filled his soul to overflowing? Was it joy for being once more, if but for a day, in the midst of his beloved Indians? It was the thought of the change that, within the short space of two years, had been wrought in the moral and religious state of that dearly-bought flock—a change of which he had, on the previous evening, obtained indubitable evidence. Alas! had that saintly man been gifted with keener sight, he could have foreseen the fate of his abandoned flock. It was but his personal influence, his holy example, his watchfulness, his charity that had so long sustained the strength and fervor of most of his neophytes. The prop being withdrawn, the fence removed, that tender plant sank to the ground and the beasts of the field came to trample upon it.

It would have fared differently with that mission had the founder been a member of an Order ever supplied with able workers to fill vacancies, and had it been in his power to procure for the children of the congregation the blessing of religious teachers. He had himself taught school, and few grew up without a fair knowledge of reading in their own language; but the boys learned no more of agriculture than their fathers, and the girls little else than what their mothers knew of thrift and cleanliness. That remarkable *pioneer* lacked one accomplishment, as necessary for an Indian *pastor* as zeal and charity. He knew nothing of farming. The land he had wisely enough secured for his flock lay idle. Fishing and hunting remained the chief occupations of his converts, with the

unavoidable accompaniments of idleness and roving, doubly dangerous under the changed circumstances—the ever-increasing contact with whites and the consequent facilities for obtaining ardent spirits.

And what has become of those poor Indians? A band of paupers and vagabonds? Such might have been their fate but for a rare good fortune. Providence sent them a pastor whose early education had not been exclusively scientific. With scanty help from outside, but with great practical knowledge and indomitable perseverance, he set about doing himself what he wished his Indians to do—tilling the land, raising stock, planting fruit trees, building houses. *Exempla trahunt.* Most of the Indians in that mission are now farming on a small scale. The children are under the tuition of devoted Sisters, as many of the girls as the limited means allow being raised in the convent, together with white children. With the help of the forthcoming Lenten alms the pastor's long-planned agricultural and industrial school for boys may yet become a reality. In the meantime the young men know that they must give good proofs of sobriety and industry before they may ask for the hand of one of the well-trained young women. Not every converted band of Indians has fared so well. Let us turn to a sad instance in point.

In the earlier part of this century, when the entire territory which now forms the dioceses of Detroit, Grand Rapids, Fort Wayne, Chicago, and Milwaukee, was travelled over by two or three missionaries, devoting their attention to both natives and thinly-scattered white settlers, quite a number of Indians, belonging to one of the more developed branches of the Algonic family, were brought into the fold and not badly instructed. The work of evangelization was interrupted by the forced removal of the tribe. A few scores of Christian families, however, having bought land, were allowed to remain in their ancient home. They built a church, and have never since been entirely destitute of spiritual succor. But the visiting missionaries, being encumbered with the charge of white congregations, could pay them but passing attention, and never learned their language. As time went on every remaining acre in that section—excellent land—was bought up by immigrants from the East, and more of it was needed. *That soil was too good for Indians.* To drive them out was not practicable. To shoot them down would have been unchristian and dangerous. But those simple people loved fine horses, shining broadcloth, glittering apparel; nor were any of them averse to the social cup. All these luxuries, together with the ordinary staff of life, they were liberally supplied with by their Christian neighbors, against mortgages, of course, on their goodly "forties" and "eighties." The result need

not be described. A remnant of the band still linger around their old chapel, gaining a poor livelihood by plaiting baskets and gathering berries. They cling to the faith, and each visit of the priest is a holiday with them. But their life is sapped, with the exception of a few who have withstood the temptation and still hold property; they are wrecks, physically and morally. Few children are born or survive. They have no future in this world.

Compare the state of that forlorn band with the thrift, the happiness, the hopeful future of Indian flocks such as the Flatheads of St. Ignatius, in Montana, that from the day of their gathering in were carefully and lovingly watched over, instructed, protected, and it will become apparent where the causes of failures must be sought for—not in the natural incapacity of the race, but partly in the defective methods employed, partly in untoward exterior circumstances. With our riper experience, then, and with our prospective ampler means, deficiencies will be supplied, errors avoided, and, against dangers from the outside, the improved public feeling and the wiser measures of the civil government may, to a certain extent, be relied upon as offering a more efficient protection. Altogether, if we but do our duty, the future of our Indian missions is more cheering than it ever was.

But we are not alone in the field. With a large number of our, non-Catholic fellow-citizens the more or less of Christian tradition and sentiment which they still retain is working as a ferment of proselytizing activity. Their religious zeal finds a natural ally in the philanthropic tendencies of the age, and the hearty aid of the Administration and its *employés* can almost invariably be counted upon by Protestant parties engaged in the Indian missions. In some quarters the very dislike of the Catholic name would seem to form an additional stimulus. Still, it cannot be doubted that a vast amount of real goodness of heart and noble devotion enter into the exertions of non-Catholic parties for the Christianization of the Indians. Add to this our own lamentable remissness in seizing the opportunities of the past, and it will be no matter of surprise if we find a large portion of the field preoccupied by the emissaries of the sects. And most of them are probably gaining a number of those simple people for their various forms of belief or opinion. The want of official statistics and the usual vagueness of Protestant missionary reports render it impossible to form a measurably exact estimate of the result of their labors; but there is no doubt that the teaching force employed by Protestantism, directly and indirectly, for moulding the minds of the Indians, largely exceeds our own.

In Indian Territory, for instance, the Methodist Church South, the Presbyterian Missionary Board, the Congregational Society,

the Southern Baptist, the Presbyterian, and the Baptist Home Missionary Societies maintain or manage no less than seven academies, four seminaries, and one university. Besides, whatever of religious influence may be exerted in the numerous public and private elementary schools (taught by whites and educated Indians) is undoubtedly Protestant. According to the agent's statement, the schools managed by religious societies, either as pay-schools or under contract with the "nations," are generally the most successful. However this may be, our own force on that large field dwindles into insignificance when compared with the strength of the sects.

Quite a number of tribes or divisions of tribes have no other form of religion presented to them than the various creeds of Protestantism. In some reservations the envoys of the sects labor side by side with our own missionaries. Besides the above-named denominations, we find the Episcopalians strongly represented, especially in Dakota; and elsewhere smaller numbers of Mennonites, Moravians, and Friends. The ministers and teachers, among whom there are not a few natives, are generally supported by associations, such as the Native Missionary Society, the American Missionary Association, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Presbyterian Women's Board of Foreign Missions, the Ladies' Home Missionary Society.

Not a few tribes, among whom we have no missions, are likewise unprovided with preachers or teachers sent directly and supported by the sects. Still, to all, or almost all of them, non-Catholic forms of belief and worship are offered, *together with the secular instruction provided for by the Government*. In very many cases the agents select the teachers—frequently members of their own household—with a view to win over the Indian youth to their own sect, or, at least, to imbue them with what they term "non-sectarian Christianity." Nor are the adults left unsolicited. They are invited to the religious exercises held by government *employés* in their residences, or in school-houses. *And semper aliquid lueret*.

If we add to this the bias given, by Protestant teachers, to the pupils in the governmental "training schools," the religious training of the children confided by the Government to various denominational institutions on reservations and "in states," and the influence which those educated youths will one day exert on their companions and families, the immense advantage will become patent which Protestantism, at the present day, has over the Church in giving direction to the religious thought of our still unconverted Indian brethren. And whatever may be the practical result—as to the forming of sincere convictions and Christian morals—of so much direct and indirect proselytizing, one thing is

certain: in the medley of truth and error, of vague, confused and diluted religious ideas, thus distilled into the Indian mind, the fundamental trait of Protestantism—denial of the one divinely instituted authority—will nowhere be wanting.

Shall we, then, censure the Administration for thus employing funds belonging to the tribes, and, to some extent, drawing upon the public treasury for the promotion of sectarian interests? We must distinguish. There is ample cause for complaint as regards the action of subaltern officers in the Indian Department. Thus, the expulsion of a Catholic missionary from a reservation because, in the race with his Episcopalian rival, he had "the inside track," the forcing of proselytizing teachers on Catholic tribes, and similar proceedings, are, to put it mildly, a disingenuous use of power, and will hardly be approved of by any fair-minded American.¹ But it

¹ The pretended offence of the missionary in question was that he had used his influence with the Indians to prevent them sending children to the Indian industrial schools—that is, the so-called Training Schools in the Sates, from which they may be expected to return more or less Protestantized.

"Regular moral and religious instruction is given daily. A part of one evening in the week is devoted to Bible study in each section, under the teacher in charge. . . . The different ministers of Carlisle have officiated for us, each one in turn taking six or seven consecutive Sundays, and giving a regular afternoon service, which was attended by all the students."

This extract from the report of the *Carlisle Indian Industrial School* speaks for itself. If the statement of an agent may be believed, children are occasionally kidnapped for those institutions. From the fact that a number of children had to be sent back to their parents, *by order of the Indian Office*, the accusation gains a color of truth.

The Superintendent of Indian Schools himself is compelled to make the following declaration.

"The method of obtaining pupils for the several training schools should be changed. Each of these schools, just before the commencement of the school year, sends its representative to the several agencies from which it expects to obtain Indian children to consent to go to the school he represents. The consequence is that promises are made to Indian children and their parents that are afterwards broken. Another bad result of this competitive canvassing for pupils for the training schools is seen in the bad physical and bad moral condition of some of the pupils thus obtained."

Evidently, "there is money" in educating Indians. And for discouraging parents from sending children to such institutions a priest is expelled from a reservation and "from the Indian country," by order of the honorable Secretary of the Interior!

Hear what an honest superintendent writes of the *Chilocco Industrial School*:

"Indians come and go at pleasure and do as they please while here. Cattlemen locate their herds on the school farm, come and go through the fences at pleasure, and defy any one who attempts to interfere. A race-course has been laid out on the school farm and horse-racing and whiskey-selling have been added to the list. It is safe to say that more drunken Indians may be seen at this school than at any agency in the Territory."

The number of teachers and other employees at that institution (including 12 "Cadet Sergeants") was *eighty-five* last year. It opened, in 1884, with 186 pupils—boys and girls; the number of pupils in 1885 is not reported. The care of 400 cattle consumed a great part of the boys' time.

The *Haskell Institute*, another training school, was built on land donated for the purpose to the Government by citizens of Lawrence, Kansas. It was visited by sick-

is of questionable propriety to find fault with the Administration for aiding private enterprise, promotive of the *civilization* of its ward, though the interests of *religious* parties may *indirectly* be promoted by such assistance. We may deeply regret, for the sake of our poor red brethren, that any number of them should be given the shadow for the substance, and that, together with the knowledge of their Creator and their duties towards Him, they should imbibe the subtle poison which slowly, but surely, corrodes both faith and charity. But we cannot consistently remonstrate against a measure of which we avail ourselves to the full extent of our ability. Our own day and boarding schools on the reservations, and such educational establishments "in the States" as are ready to receive Indian pupils, are, on the whole, placed on the same footing with those of the sects. In many of our missions, the teaching Sisters and Brothers are salaried out of funds due the tribes by treaty; and the Indian boarders in most of our institutions are either drawing the equivalent of their "rations" in money, or are otherwise sustained by contract. Nothing, then, remains for us to do in that contest—that dread competition for souls—but to multiply or enlarge our educational establishments on reservations and in Indian neighborhoods, to receive Indian pupils in our religious institutions throughout the country, and then apply for our quota of the Indian funds.¹

ness and death, in the first year of its existence; of 280 pupils, ten (between 15 and 23 years of age) died of pneumonia and congestion of heart and lungs. The anxiety for securing pupils had been so great that the house was occupied before the walls were dry and the heating apparatus in working order.

Truly, "there is a war going on for the Indians," as one of the Dakota pupils of *Hampton Institute* was made to say in her commencement speech last year.

¹ On this thorny question, the Indian School Superintendent thus expresses himself in his Report to the Department of the Interior, in 1885.

"All persons who know what has been done by Christian effort in Indian educational work, must heartily agree in saying that this effort should not be permitted to relax by reason of a failure of the government to encourage religious organizations that wish to send their schoolmasters among Indians. But the desire of the government to induce religious and philanthropic organizations not to relax their efforts for the benefit of the Indian should not lead it into the mistake of permitting any sect or educational society to use the friendship of the government in its own interest—to use the government in any effort to proselytize or fill its own purse.

"Therefore, the government should enter into no entangling alliance with any religious denomination or educational society. It should not permit any religious society to make its proselyters or its missionaries, as such, teachers of government schools. In other words, it should not permit any teacher to be appointed and paid by the government as a Presbyterian or Catholic or Episcopalian or Baptist government school teacher, and it should not, in its liberality, say to either the Catholic or Presbyterian or Baptist or Episcopalian Church: 'Here are school-buildings, which have been erected by the use of an appropriation made by Congress for the purpose of establishing a government school for Indians. You may take them free of rent and supply the school with teachers who are of your church, and make it an Indian school of your denomination, and the government will pay you so much per capita per annum for every In-

The assignment of the Indian Agencies to the several religious denominations—a measure as unpractical as it was unjust—has, under our last Administration, been happily dropped. If not yet absolutely free to plant the cross wherever we choose on the reservations and in Indian territory, we have before us a wide field for the display of missionary zeal and enterprise,—wider, in fact, than we may hope to supply for many years to come. In most of our existing missions there is room for expansion. Tribes, once partly or wholly Catholic—and still so, nominally at least,—are destitute of residing missionaries, and but rarely visited. A number of agencies among pagan tribes, that once were offered to Protestant denominations, have been left uncared for by the respective sects; and we are now welcome, nay, solicited, to enter upon the field.¹ How long we are to enjoy this privilege, is another question.

dian child you may induce or the government may compel to attend the school.' If the government were to give away to one church one of its school-buildings on such terms, it would be compelled, if its acts were controlled by logic, to give another building to another church, until it would have none under its own control, and there would be inaugurated, under the supervision of the government, a wrangle of the sects over the appropriations on the one hand, and over the souls of the Indians on the other. The government should control, by its own appointees, all schools which occupy buildings erected with funds appropriated for school-building purposes. While doing this, the government should be liberal in making contracts with religious denominations to teach Indian children in schools established by those denominations. It should throw open the door and say to all denominations: 'There should be no monopoly in good works. Enter all of you and do whatever your hands may find of good work to do, and in your efforts the government will give to you encouragement out of its liberal purse.' In other words, the government, without partiality, should encourage all the churches to work in this broad field of philanthropic endeavor, but in its management of government schools it should be in no degree under sectarian control."

In 1885, there existed contracts between the government and the President of our Indian Bureau, according to which the former was to pay from \$100 to \$120 per annum for as many Indian pupils—not exceeding the number of about 2000—as there would be boarded and instructed in 21 different Catholic institutions. This is far in excess of what non-Catholic parties obtained, and—probably—asked for; and well may they be satisfied with what is done, indirectly, for the furtherance of their cause, in about 130 government schools, with more than 1100 teachers and employees. The number of *Government schools under Catholic superintendence* is seven, with about fifty teachers.

¹ The following quotations from the reports of agents are here given for what they may be worth. They certainly contain food for reflection.

Round Valley Agency, Cal.

"No missionary has been sent to this agency for several years past. I have applied to several church organizations for a missionary, but up to this time none has been sent. . . . A regular Sabbath school has been maintained during the year with a very large attendance." (This agency was formerly assigned to the Methodists.)

Tula River Agency, Cal.

"No missionary work has ever been done for the Indians, only by their agents and employees, except an occasional visit of a Catholic priest. They have, however, been

The current of feeling in high and influential circles, it would seem, is rather against us. It is difficult, at least, otherwise to explain the singular mistake lately made by the Administration—the publication of a document, printed by order of Congress, at the expense of the United States Treasury, and containing the reports of various Protestant societies engaged in the Indian missions, together with speeches delivered at a conference of the “friends of Indian civilization,” in one of which the following passage—referring to the Presbyterian mission among the Pueblos—occurs:

“You all understand how difficult our work has been there—the communities being generally Catholic and under the influence of the priests. In spite of the Catholic priests, and what is a great deal worse, the Mormon priests, we have made our way, because the people thought we spoke better English.”¹

under Catholic influence ever since coming in contact with the Mexican population.” (Formerly assigned to the Methodists.)

Mescalero and Jicarilla Apache Agency, N. Mexico.

“Father Garnier, curé of Lincoln, occasionally passes here. He is a very pious and worthy man, but his parish is so large that he has no time to devote to work here.” (The number of Indians belonging to that agency is 1383. They were once given to the Presbyterians.)

Ouray Agency, Utah.

“There has been no missionary work done among these Indians since the establishment of the agency, excepting by the Mormons. . . . This agency is under the control of the Unitarian religious society, who have never done any work among the Indians owing to the lack of accommodations for a missionary.” (1252 Indians.)

Crow Agency, Montana.

“During the four years I have been in charge of this agency no missionary work has been done on this reservation.” (There are 3973 Crows and Cheyennes on the reservation. They have lately been visited by a Jesuit Father. The agency was once assigned to the Methodists.)

Quinault Agency, Wash.

“We have no missionary here, nor none to visit occasionally. The distance and the difficulty in reaching the agency are too great to expect it. What we do is to give a good moral tone to our system, to have sabbath service, to dress our scholars in their best on the Lord’s day, to have some little luxury prepared for them, to hold a singing service, and help them by our demeanor and advice.” (This agency, too, was once given to the Methodists.)

Colorado River Agency, Arizona (1884).

“The Sabbath day is spent by the opening of Sabbath school in the morning with regular exercises, in which all the teachers engage very earnestly. In the afternoon there is prayer meeting and pleasant gospel teaching, singing, etc. In the evening there is a short lecture or talk, bible reading, and singing exercises. There is a splendid field here for missionary work, and it is to be hoped some one will come and enter the good work at an early day.” (1012 Indians.)

¹ In some newspaper articles under the heading, “Has Cleveland found his Burghard?” the above passage (in the speech of the Rev. Dr. Kendall) is commented on in this wise:

“From this we would infer that the board and the evangelical agencies by which it

The political party opposed to the present Administration has quickly perceived and adroitly made use of that blunder. As to us, the most practical protest—the only one worthy of true Catholic mettle—against such mistaken policy will be a hearty, generous, and universal endorsement of our beloved prelates' late enactments for the support of the Indian missions. The opportunity for joining in this protest will be given to all, not excluding the most humble members of the mystic body of Christ, when, on the next first Sunday of Lent, the plate will be passed around in our churches.

is working, and the President who so warmly approves their methods, all regard Mormonism, Catholicism and Paganism as nearly equal evils from which the Indian must be converted."

This is rather disingenuous. The President, it is true, highly complimented the efforts of the "Friends of Indian civilization" (a committee of whom waited on him), and remarked that he had "learned to acknowledge, and more so every day, the benefit which this government has received and the obligation which it owes to Christian and secular teaching." But that interview took place *previously* to the meeting at which Dr. Kendall delivered his remarkable speech, and it is more than doubtful that the committee in question submitted their anti-Catholic plan of campaign for the President's approval.

The document referred to in our text is the "Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners for 1885," and must not be confounded with the "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs," from which the extracts in our notes are taken. It contains accounts of the work of the Indian missions of the Baptists, the Congregationalists, the Episcopalians, the Friends, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians, but ignores the labors of Catholic missionaries.

The following extracts from the reports of Pueblo agents will be read with interest, in this connection.

"I reckon there are, more or less, fifteen hundred boys and girls in the nineteen Pueblos, who attend no school, but are growing in idleness, in indolence, in superstition. . . . This gloomy and truly sad picture, but true, has a way of being avoided by declaring by law that the education of the Indian youth is *obligatory* for every one of them between the ages of eight and eighteen years, under correctional pain. . . . Pedro Sanchez, Ind. Ag."

The successor of Mr. Pedro Sanchez happily takes a different view of the matter. He writes:

"I am sorry to say that the day-schools in this agency have not done very well, partly due to the teachers themselves and partly to the parents of the children. The teachers only taught school two hours in the morning and none in the afternoon, and they have paid more attention to missionary work than to teach the Indians the rudiments of learning. The parents of the children told me, in all the pueblos where there are schools, that they, being Catholics, did not like and would not send their children to Protestant schools, and I did not see a single instance where the schools are, where a boy could read and write. I strongly recommend these day schools in the pueblos, but on a different plan from what they have been heretofore. The teachers should be men that may know English and Spanish thoroughly, because the latter is the general language of all the Pueblo Indians, and of the religious denomination the Indians may want, that is, Catholics, because the Indians have told me plainly they will not send their children to Protestant schools, as the daily attendance of the children will prove. . . . Dolores Romero, Ind. Ag."

The average attendance in six day schools was, respectively, 20, 12, 10, 7, 7, 6. Six teachers and two assistants were paid for their labors (as above)—one, \$900, five each \$720, one \$480, and one \$360, per annum. The first Catholic Pueblo school was to be opened this month (September, 1885). May others soon follow!

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM AND PROTESTANTISM.

THE public school question has assumed a new phase. New parties have entered the field of controversy, while one of the old ones has retired. The new parties to which we refer are Protestants, who have taken opposite sides, while the party that has retired from the field of strife is the great body of Catholics in the United States.

We do not mean to imply that Catholics have changed their convictions respecting the public school system, its unfairness and defectiveness, and its pernicious influences. On the contrary, their convictions on all these points have become deeper and stronger. But they have ceased in great degree from arguing the question with the advocates and defenders of the system. There is a time to speak and a time to be silent. As long as there was any probability that Catholics could turn non-Catholic public opinion in a right direction by protest and argument, they protested and argued. But protest and argument have not availed, and the only course the Catholics of the United States can consistently adopt is to withdraw their children from the public schools, and establish special Catholic schools for their education.

Meanwhile, the public school system has gone on extending itself, and completing itself after its own fundamental ideas and principles. It has taken possession of the whole field of non-Catholic education excepting collegiate, technical, and professional education; and even the non-Catholic colleges and other like institutions that have not been absorbed or destroyed by the public school system, have adopted, or are rapidly adopting its principle of ignoring religion.

While the public school system has thus had full opportunity to extend and develop itself and to exert its legitimate but pernicious influence upon non-Catholics, the Catholic population of our country are being gradually, and, of late years, with increasing rapidity, brought under the influences of a Catholic school system. Already more than half a million of children are being educated in Catholic parochial schools, and the number of these schools is not only increasing, but they are also growing as regards comprehensiveness of scope and thoroughness of instruction and discipline. The Church in the United States has committed itself to the work of establishing a general and complete system of parochial school education, and, with a few exceptions here and there, bishops, priests and laity

are heartily and vigorously engaged in carrying on this good and all-important work.

To this there are some exceptions. There are those who continue lukewarm and dilatory as regards this subject. There are parishes abundantly able to establish parochial schools that are still destitute of them, and other parishes which could have excellently equipped and organized parochial schools, but which have schools that, in the shabbiness and slovenliness of their arrangements and the insufficiency and inefficiency of their instruction and discipline, are a shame and a disgrace to those parishes. A like remark is, perhaps, applicable to a few populous dioceses which are financially able to engage vigorously in the work of establishing a parochial school system, but which have not as yet undertaken it. But these are exceptions. The time seems near at hand when Catholic schools for Catholic children will be established throughout our country, and Catholic children will be almost entirely withdrawn from the public schools.

All this is a sore disappointment to Protestants who expected and hoped that the public school system could be so managed that it would be an efficient instrumentality for Protestantizing Catholic children. They hoped and expected that Catholic children would largely adopt the Protestant idea of private judgment, and recruit the membership of Protestant "churches." This expectation has utterly failed of realization. The public schools do tend to de-Catholicize the Catholic children who continue to attend them. Their influence does certainly weaken the faith and the spirit of obedience to ecclesiastical authority and the precepts of the Church. But this de-Catholicizing process does not furnish recruits to the Protestant sects. The Catholic pupils of the public schools who are thus de-Catholicized, do not generally become Protestants; they become indifferentists, practical rationalists and infidels. Protestants, therefore, gain no accession of strength from this tendency of the public school system.

And while the public school system has disappointed Protestants as regards Catholic children, it has also disappointed them as regards its effects upon Protestant children. Instead of serving as a help to the Protestant sects, and training up the children of Protestants to become active members of those sects, as many Protestant ministers contended they would, they tend to weaken the respect of those children for the religious opinions and practices of their parents, and to inoculate them with rationalistic and materialistic ideas.

This tendency of the public school system, and its hostile influences as regards what is commonly called "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestantism, have become so obvious that a number of

more discerning and thoughtful Protestants acknowledge it, and are searching for a remedy. Many of these, there is reason to think, believe in their hearts that the Catholic position with regard to the present public school system is the right one. But they despair of convincing the Protestant sects of the fact, or rather they despair of inducing them to act energetically and practically upon it. They see that they are hopelessly divided as respects religious belief and practice, and they think that this division among themselves creates an insuperable obstacle to their uniting in any common effort to introduce positive religious instruction into the public schools. Moreover, they know that it would be futile to propose to the members of their respective sects to adopt the Catholic method of practically solving the question, by each "Orthodox" Protestant sect establishing schools for the children of its own members, maintained by voluntary individual contributions. For they are fully aware that the members of those sects are lacking in the zeal and Christian generosity and the sense of Christian obligation necessary to induce them to consent to bear the burden such an arrangement would involve.

As regards this last mentioned point, they are undoubtedly correct. Their religion is entirely lacking in the elements which induce and enable Catholics to make the sacrifices which they constantly make, and feel that they must cheerfully make for the sake of religion; among which is that of sustaining Catholic schools. But, as regards the point first mentioned, they are partly right and partly wrong.

The divided, self-antagonistic condition of "Orthodox" Protestants is unquestionably a difficulty in the way of their finding a common ground on which to unite in contending for the introduction of religious education into the public schools. Yet it is not an insurmountable obstacle.

In fact, the real difficulty, so far as it is a difficulty, consists not so much in the fact of the existing differences and divisions of the "Orthodox" Protestant sects, as in that of their mutual jealousies, and also in the general indifference and lukewarmness of Protestant parents as to the religious education of their children.

Protestant sects could unite, without any serious difficulty, upon a plan or method of introducing religious instruction into the public school system, were they able to forego or subordinate their mutual jealousies of each other, and their common jealousy of the Catholic Church.

That this is possible is proved by the fact that, in other countries than the United States, the difficulty has been more or less successfully surmounted by different methods, and with, at least, approximate justice to the civil and religious rights of the mem-

bers of all religious denominations, and an approximately equal distribution both of the burdens and the benefits of the educational systems maintained in those countries.

The methods are different in different countries, but they all have a common aim and object, viz., the maintaining of such a system of public education as will enable parents of different religious beliefs to avail themselves of the system, without violation of their rights of conscience; or, in other words, to have their children, under the public school system, trained up and instructed in their respective religious beliefs, as well as in merely secular knowledge.

This principle, in fact, is acknowledged and in more or less successful practical operation in every country in Europe, excepting Russia, France and Italy. In semi-barbarous Russia there is no system of common school education, and the State-supported technical schools and colleges and universities are simply nests for hatching out infidels of the most pronounced atheistic type. In France, the very name of God has been banished from the public schools and excluded from the text-books; and, since reference to His divine and incommunicable attributes can *not* be excluded from human thought, these have been *heathenized*, by employing, wherever reference to them is necessary, the names of the false gods of Roman and Grecian mythology, Jupiter, Jove, Minerva, Mars, Mercury, Apollo, Venus! In Italy, the whole influence and action of its government is openly and avowedly against all religious education, and in favor of a purely materialistic and irreligious education.

Is it not a shame and a disgrace to the people of the United States, and especially to the great majority of the Protestants of the United States, that, professing, as they do, to be firm believers in Christianity and ardent supporters of "a pure Gospel," which they desire shall be propagated over all the earth, they yet sustain and defend a system of education which undermines, in the hearts of their children, their own declared belief; which refuses to adopt any of the plans or methods of European nations that recognize the necessity of religious education, and which, in principle, follows the example and adopts the ideas (though, as yet, it dare not openly carry them out to their full extent) of the infidel governments of France and Italy!

We have said that there are different plans and methods by which Protestants, thrusting into the background their mutual jealousies, may obtain the benefits of a religious education of their children by a modification of the present public school system, without any serious advantage or disadvantage to any Protestant sect. With deliberate intention, we exclude all reference to Cath-

olics from this part of our discussion. For, it is a fixed conclusion, a matter now of absolute certainty, that, whether the public school system shall eventually be so modified, or not, as to permit the introduction of positive, distinctive, denominational religious instruction, Catholics and the Catholic Church in this country will see to it that the children of Catholic parents shall receive Catholic religious instruction and training.

Moreover, not only Catholics knew from the first, but Protestants have learned from the actual practical operation of the present public school system, that it is utterly vain for them to expect (as unquestionably many of them did expect) to obtain recruits to the membership of their different sects from the Catholic children who attend the public schools. It is an undeniable and most deeply to be deplored fact that many of these children do fall away from belief in the Catholic religion, and still more of them from practising it and attending to their religious duties. But these apostates from the faith or from the practice of the Catholic religion do not become, except in a very few and rare instances, members of any "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestant sect. The vast majority of them become entirely neglectful of and indifferent to religious obligations, or practical infidels.

Of different methods or plans for introducing and maintaining distinctive denominational instruction in public schools, without favoring any religious denomination to the disadvantage of others, we will refer to only two.

One of these methods is, that each religious denomination shall establish its own denominational schools with such arrangements as the educational wants of the children of each denomination require. Then, in order to distribute the moneys arising from public school taxation proportionately and fairly between each denomination (and so, too, as regards undenominational and entirely secular schools), each taxpayer is allowed to designate, according to his individual preferences, what schools, whether denominational or undenominational, the school-tax he pays shall go to support. In this way the schools of each denomination and those of no religious denomination form parts of the public school system and stand on a basis of perfect equality in the eye of the law.

A modification of this plan is to allow each taxpayer personally to pay over the amount of his school-tax directly to the support of such denominational or undenominational schools as he may prefer. On payment of his school-tax in this way, he receives a written voucher, which, when exhibited to the public school treasurer or collector, is accepted as proof that he has paid his school-tax.

This plan, under either form, is theoretically fair and just. But

in its practical administration, sundry difficulties would arise. We, consequently, dismiss it without further remark.

The other plan is one that is not only theoretically fair and just, but has the merit of having been adopted, and found, on actual trial, to work successfully in a number of European countries and in Canada. In each of these countries, it has been modified, as regards details, to suit the different circumstances and educational wants of the people. But the essential, fundamental idea is preserved.

The plan is this: All public school taxes are paid into a common public school fund. From this fund equal *pro rata* allotments are made to all public schools, according to the respective number of pupils who regularly attend them, and attain to a certain specified standard of scholarship in their respective grades and studies.

These allotments are made irrespective of the denominational or undenominational character of the schools, whether they are Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Lutheran, or entirely undenominational and purely secular.

Official examiners or inspectors are appointed, who examine all candidates for the position of teachers in these schools, without respect to their religious tenets. The examinations refer to purely secular branches of knowledge, and certificates of competency are given or withheld, according to the actual results of those examinations. No one is permitted to teach in these public schools without a certificate of competency from the official examiners.

Under this plan, when fairly and impartially carried out, full justice is done to the rights and preferences of parents of different religious beliefs and to those who have no religious belief. Catholics can send their children to Catholic schools, Protestants can send theirs to their several sectarian schools, and persons, who prefer undenominational and entirely secular schools, can send their children to such schools.

This plan has been adopted in other countries and under different modifications, as we have already said, and gives general satisfaction. It aims to do equal justice to Catholics, to members of the Established Church, to non-conformists of different sects, and to those who are indifferentists or pure secularists as regards religious belief.

The only difficulty that has arisen in England respecting it is, that the purely secular element preponderates in the administration of the system, and exercises favoritism towards the non-denominational schools and against those which are denominational, and particularly against Catholic schools.

Still, the system has such obvious advantages over an entirely undenominational system, from which distinctive religious instruc-

tion is excluded, that Catholics, Anglicans and the different non-conformist Protestant bodies of England unite in upholding it, and in opposing the introduction of an undenominational and purely secular system.

In Belgium, a system exists, based on the same general idea, by which Catholic and Protestant, and purely secular schools are aided or supported by appropriations from the public school fund, though, strictly speaking, the number of Protestants in Belgium is small, the people being almost entirely divided between the Catholics and the Secularists.

In the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the majority of the people are Catholics, but the preferences of Protestants are carefully respected, and provision is made in the administration of the public school system for appropriations, without distinction, from the school funds to Protestant schools in which Protestant religious instruction is imparted, as well as for schools in which the Catholic Religion is taught, along with secular branches of knowledge.

In the Dominion of Canada a like system prevails, and Protestant and Catholic schools, and so, too, undenominational or purely secular schools, are aided or supported by public school funds, without regard to their religious or non-religious status.

In these, and in other countries which have adopted the system we are describing, there are differences of administrative details and of the manner in which the public school funds are raised and distributed. But these differences do not affect the general principle of impartiality and non-interference, on the part of the State and its officials, with the religious preferences and rights of parents; and the appropriations from the State public school funds to Catholic schools, to Protestant denominational schools, and to undenominational schools, are made on a fair and equitable basis.

In all these countries the government officials have no power to interfere with the internal managements of the schools. They visit and inspect them from time to time, and examine the pupils periodically, or are present at their examination, and note the results. Thus the comparative efficiency of the different schools is ascertained, and they are all kept up to the government standard of thoroughness in instruction and training, under the penalty, in case of failure, of not receiving the government allotment. Beyond this, there is usually no interference on the part of government officials.

In England the results of these periodical examinations are carefully tabulated and published. They furnish a fair basis for comparisons between the different schools, and these comparisons show conclusively that, as regards efficiency in promoting intellectual development and imparting secular knowledge, the denomi-

national schools keep fully abreast, and are frequently in advance of the undenominational or purely secular schools. As regards their influence upon the moral and religious habits and characters of the pupils, they are infinitely superior.

There is no real obstacle to the introduction of a like system into the United States, except that which unreasoning prejudice creates. In the present state of public opinion, the vast majority of Protestants join with Indifferentists and Secularists in opposing it. But this opposition, so far as Protestants are concerned, as we will show before we close, is really opposition to their own denominational interests. It is a practical surrender by them of the advantages they might derive from a public school system such as we have broadly sketched. It is a handing over of the present public school system to the promotion of Rationalism and mere Secularism.

Protestants usually assert that the change we are advocating is impracticable, though many of them declare that they would heartily favor it, were it possible to adopt it.

But the alleged impracticability is purely imaginary. That it has no foundation in fact is proved by the actual successful workings of the system under different modifications in the countries we have mentioned.

Were the system adopted in this country, there would not be any real difficulty in Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists and other Protestant sects having each its own distinctive denominational schools; and so, also, Catholics; and so, also, on the other hand, those who would prefer entirely undenominational or purely secular schools, each receiving from the public school fund *pro rata* allotments, according to the respective number of pupils that, on periodical examinations, were found to have attained an average standard of scholarship in certain specified studies.

The only possible actual difficulty in carrying out such an arrangement that we have ever heard mentioned, is that, in some regions of our country, the number of members of one or another religious denomination is so small that the allotments that would be made to a school for the children of that denomination in such a locality would be insufficient to sustain a school.

Consequently, it is objected that, under such a public school system as we have described, all the denominations of numerous membership could have denominational schools, but those which, in particular localities, had but few members and few children, could not receive enough money from the public school fund to sustain denominational schools for them.

The objection has a basis in actually existing facts. There are

localities in our country where, for example, it would be difficult or impossible to find Hebrew, or Catholic, or Episcopalian children enough to constitute even a small school. So, doubtless, there are other districts where it would be difficult to find a sufficient number of children, of Baptist, or Methodist, or Lutheran parents.

But this fact, after all, constitutes no real objection to the introduction of the system. For, in such cases, the denomination, which has so few members, and so widely scattered, would have to submit to the disadvantage, just as in such cases they now have to do without denominational churches and ministers, and without regular denominational worship of their own distinctive type.

Then, too, the proportionate number of members of each denomination that, under this system, could not have the advantage of denominational schools, would be very small as compared with the number that could. Moreover, these exceptional instances of disadvantage would be distributed among the different denominations, with approximate equality. And whatever small inequality would still be found to exist, would fall most heavily upon the Hebrews and the Catholics. The former congregate most numerous in our large towns and cities, and in those places they would receive their full proportion of the public school fund. Still, their relation to the public school fund would be infinitely better than it is now. For, so far as distinctive religious education in the Hebrew belief is concerned, their children are entirely shut out from all provision for them in our present public school system.

The Catholics, in like manner, would be at a disadvantage, particularly in our southern and western States and Territories, and also in very many country districts even in New England and the Atlantic "Middle" States. Still, in comparison with their present relation to the public school fund, approximate justice would be done them, whereas now they receive none.

There is another consideration which would reduce to a minimum the practical operation of the fact which forms the basis of the objection we have been considering, so far as Protestants are concerned. It is that, in sparsely settled districts where there may be many Protestant denominations, each or most of them having but few members, all, or nearly all, the "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestant sects could unite in having religious instruction in a Union Protestant public school. For they contend that their doctrinal differences are non-essential.

They annually send delegates from their "synods" and "assemblies" and "conventions" to declare to each other their mutual fraternal interest and affection. They constantly interchange pulpits and fraternize on almost every public occasion. They form and maintain "Evangelical Alliances," in which they declare and pro-

claim, that, though they keep up different religious organizations, they are one in their essential belief and practice. They unite in maintaining their "Young Men's Christian Associations," in having weekly or monthly "Ministerial Conferences." Still more, as regards their Sunday Schools, they maintain a "Sunday School Union." This institution furnishes the religious literature which is distributed to four-fifths or five-sixths, at least, of the children who attend Protestant Sunday Schools in the United States, without regard to their sectarian differences. This Union supplies their hymn-books, their question-books, and other books for religious exercises and instruction.

Now, this being the case, the question at once arises, and we put it to Protestants to answer, "Why, in districts where each Protestant sect has only a few members, and only a few children to educate, can they not thus combine in a common '*union*' public school for the education of their children?" They have thus combined, they do thus combine on *Sundays*. Why can they not thus combine on week days?

Were they willing to do this, it would remove all difficulty in their case of securing the amplest provision from the public school fund for the moral and religious, as well as the intellectual instruction of their children. There is hardly a hamlet or township throughout our whole country in which Protestants could not have a "Union" Protestant school, while, in all our large towns and cities, and throughout the densely populated parts of the country, they could have separate Protestant denominational schools.

In many country districts Catholics, owing to their fewness, could not have Catholic schools, and it would be upon them, and not upon Protestants, that these exceptional inequalities in the practical working of the system would chiefly fall. Yet, still the disadvantage at which they would be placed in certain localities would be small compared with that which, under the present school system, they must submit to.

There remains but one other objection that needs answering. It is that a public school system, such as we have referred to, would be more expensive than the present one.

Were this objection founded on fact, the moral advantages resulting from the introduction of the system we mention would far outweigh any considerations of increased pecuniary outlay. They would be paid back, too, ten times over, in the saving of the enormous present public expenditure for the prevention, repression and punishment of crime. That vice and crimes are increasing in the United States with far greater rapidity than our increase in population, is an indisputable fact; that the public schools exert no appreciable influence against this increase, is also indisputable.

When they were first projected, and for some years after they were generally introduced, their advocates insisted that they would promote virtue and morality, as well as intellectual development.

There were, however, among the "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestants, a very large number of hard-headed folks who believed otherwise, particularly among the Germans of the interior counties of Pennsylvania. They justified their opposition to un-denominational public schools by the homely and pithy maxim, that "the more fully you instruct children in secular knowledge, unaccompanied with religious training, the greater rascals you will make them." Their opposition was overcome; but that their declaration has a foundation in fact, experience has fully proved.

The failure of the public schools to train their pupils in good morals and virtuous habits, along with secular instruction, is so evident that, contrary to the very arguments which were used when the public schools were first projected and introduced, their defenders now assert that it is no part of the purpose and object of public schools to teach morality or train their pupils in virtuous habits; that their purpose includes nothing more than that of imparting secular knowledge and promoting intellectual development.

This is a virtual acknowledgment of the entire failure of the present public school system to do the work it was originally instituted to do. The State taxes its citizens for the support of public schools, in order that, through them, the rising generation may be trained up, not simply to be intellectually smart and keen and sharp, but that they may become *good citizens*, law-abiding, moral, virtuous members of society, and thus may strengthen the State and add to public prosperity and welfare.

We repeat, therefore, that, in acknowledging that the public schools, on their present basis, cannot, efficiently, teach morality and train their pupils to virtuous habits, the supporters and defenders of the present system virtually confess that it is a failure, as regards its original purpose—the training up of good, virtuous citizens.

Moreover, this acknowledgment is a wholesale condemnation of the public schools. It is a virtual denial, too, of the right of the State to tax its citizens, and appropriate even a single dollar to support such a system.

The sole, the only plea of right the State can put forward for sustaining any public school system of education, is that that system trains up *better*, not "smarter" citizens; that it makes the children more *virtuous*, as well as more *intelligent*. If the system fails in accomplishing this, it fails entirely, as regards its proper and legitimate purpose.

And, if it fails in *this*, as we contend the present public school system has notoriously and confessedly failed, then the tens of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars that, throughout our States and Territories, are annually expended in supporting our present ineffective, one-sided, godless system of public schools, is worse than wasted. We go further even than this, and assert that the present school system is simply a machine for practically de-Christianizing and un-Christianizing the children, and for training up a generation of intellectually smart, quick, keen, law-evading, and law dis-obeying citizens.

This is a sufficient answer to the assertion that a denominational school system would involve greater expense. It would not, at all events, be an utter failure, as regards its moral results, as the present school system confessedly is.

The money that would be expended upon it, be the amount greater or smaller than that which now is expended in supporting our present public school system, would not be expended for useless purposes, so far as the public welfare is concerned. It would not be expended in training children into men and women indifferent as to religious belief and obligations, practical infidels, regardless of law and of the obligations of divinely revealed religion. For, however widely we, as Catholics, may differ from, and oppose each and all of the Protestant sects, we freely and unhesitatingly acknowledge that the wide and irreconcilable differences of their doctrinal tenets do not reach to a denial of the divine origin of Christianity, nor to a denial of the fact of a divine revelation. And "each and all" Protestants who can and do train their children in this belief, do a better work, beyond all comparison, than citizens who give up their children to a system of instruction and training which tends, practically, to make them disbelievers in any divinely revealed religion, and which thus destroys, in their minds, every substantial basis of morality.

How much of all the vast waste of public money, under the present un-Christian, secular, materialistic, atheistic system of public instruction would be saved by the introduction of positive religious, denominational instruction and training, we leave to others to compute. Suffice it to say that there would be an immense saving in police expenses, in criminal court expenses, in prison expenses.

Thus far we have been arguing the question on the concession that the cost of the proposed denominational public school system would be greater than that of the present system of undenominational public schools. But, in fact, we deny the concession. Our actual contention is that the cost of the proposed system would be no greater, and perhaps less, than that of the present system, while

the moral results for the good order and welfare of society would be infinitely greater.

In the first place, the distribution of the public school fund would be taken almost entirely out of the sphere of partisan politics. The extent to which practical "jobbery" and favoritism on account of partisan preferences are practised, in connection with the administration of the present public school system, is known to be very great. Under the proposed system, it could scarcely exist.

In the second place, the public school fund would be more fairly and equally distributed, as between the wealthy and the poor. It was not originally intended that the public schools should be so graded up into high schools and technical colleges, and should include so extensive a course of accomplishments as to satisfy the wants of the wealthy few. The public schools were professedly designed to be "*common* schools," that is, schools whose arrangements and selection of studies should be sufficient for the common needs of the public as a whole, and should not go beyond them.

Yet, as they are now practically administered, the greater amount of the money raised from taxation for the support of the public school system, goes to sustain departments and arrangements, and to pay for instruction in special studies and accomplishments, of which only the wealthy few can avail themselves, while to the "masses," to the vast majority of the people, these expenditures are not of the slightest benefit. Not only, indeed, are they of no benefit to them, but they absorb an inordinate part of the public school fund. They constantly provide for the wealthy few the most efficient teachers the public schools are able to furnish, and the most complete educational apparatus that money can procure, while the children of the masses of the majority of the people of the United States must put up with the remnants; the crumbs that fall from the public school table, inferior school buildings, inferior school apparatus, inferior school-teachers.

Under a "denominational" school system these abuses, this gross injustice, would be measurably prevented, and the administration of the public school fund would be more strictly confined to the professed original purpose and object, the education of the children of the "masses," of the majority of the people, in rudimentary, useful, practical, solid branches of knowledge:

Thirdly, under a "denominational" public school system there would be tens and hundreds of thousands of citizens, not only Catholic citizens, but also non-Catholic who could conscientiously avail themselves of it, but who, under the existing system, conscientiously refuse to send their children to the public schools. From considerations referring to the moral training of their children, they now

send them to private schools, or other educational institutions than those sustained by the public school funds, while at the same time they are compelled to pay their quota of public school taxes. From this double burden these citizens (forming, in the aggregate, a large part of the people of our country), would be relieved.

We have answered, we think, all the objections that, with any seeming right or reason, can be brought against a denominational school system.

We return, therefore, to the leading idea with which we started out. It is that "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestants are simply "cutting their own throats," in supporting an undenominational or "unsectarian" public school system. Or, to change the figure of speech, they are strangling the "churches" of which they are respectively members, by the "undenominational" or unsectarian education of their children, under the present public school system.

Whether "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestantism could or could not resist, for a century or two longer, the solvent of its own inherent self-contradictions, it must be perfectly obvious to all keenly observing and logically reasoning Protestants that it cannot resist the unmistakable tendency of the public school system to propagate mere rationalism, naturalism, and practical materialistic atheism. That is, Protestantism cannot resist this tendency unless Protestant parents withdraw their children from public undenominational schools, and establish Evangelical Orthodox Protestant schools.

But this Protestant parents will *not* do. They (or vast numbers of them) would be glad to have such schools and to send their children to them. But they will not consent to bear the double burden of paying school taxes under the existing system and also incurring the expense of separate distinctive denominational schools. They lack the necessary faith, the necessary confidence in the certainty and truth of their convictions, the necessary religious zeal and spirit of self-sacrifice.

As regards Catholics, the result is and will be different. Between them and the upholders of purely secular education, the issue has been definitely made, argued, and decided. The Catholic Church has declared, and the Catholics of the United States, as elsewhere, intelligently and conscientiously accept the declaration, that mere secular education is godless education, and that Catholic children shall not be subjected to its demoralizing influences. Already half a million of the children of Catholics have been withdrawn from the public schools and are being trained up as *Christians*—as CATHOLICS, in distinctive Catholic schools. Year by year, month by month, nay, day by day, the number of these

schools and of their pupils is increasing, and the time is not far distant when a Catholic church or parish that has not connected with it a Catholic school will be an exceptional instance.

The battle between secular schools and Catholic schools for Catholic children has been fought and won, and won in favor of the Catholic side of the contention. We do not deny that the victory bears heavily on Catholics as regards dollars and cents. They must pay their public school taxes and, at the same time, pay all the expenses of sustaining Catholic parochial schools and other Catholic educational institutions.

But the Catholics of the United States have counted the cost and are prepared to pay it. It is unjust that they should be thus doubly taxed and burdened. Yet they will submit to the injustice rather than have their children demoralized, de-Christianized, and practically infidelized. It is not the first, nor the second, nor the third instance of unfairness and injustice, that as law-obeying, peace-preserving citizens of the United States, Catholics have had to endure. As the ancient fish-wife, of Boston, when remonstrated with, by a spectator, for skinning live eels, replied, "It does not hurt them, they are used to it," so the Catholics of the United States are "used" to suffering injustice for the sake of religion and of their religious obligations.

But with Protestants the case is different. They will not pay public school taxes and at the same time incur the expense of supporting distinctive denominational schools. Yet without such denominational schools for the instruction and training of Protestant children, it is as certain as that day succeeds night, that each and all of the Protestant sects will lose their identity and their distinctive existence, and will dissolve down into mere undogmatic, undistinctive, vague, rationalistic naturalism.

Our conclusion is that in sustaining and defending of the present "undenominational" system of public school education, "Evangelical," orthodox Protestantism is simply working out its own destruction.

Scientific Chronicle.

RECENT EARTHQUAKES.

FEW of the many accounts of the late Earth movements in Charleston, South Carolina, and in the surrounding States are reliable, or such as to give us any data for a true scientific study of the phenomenon. As earthquakes have occurred only at very far off intervals in most of our States, no wonder that no provision has been made for their exact observation. In fact, even when foreseen, observations on the attendant phenomena are not easily made, as a recent experiment has made apparent. Last October, on the occasion of the blasting of Flood Rock, in Long Island Sound, preparations were made to study the propagation of the earth's wave resulting from that great explosion, which may be compared to a diminutive earthquake. The results, however, were by no means satisfactory. It was to be expected, then, that in the late unforeseen shock of August 31st there would be much uncertainty in determining the centre of oscillation of the earthquake waves and their rate of propagation. Speaking of the Flood Rock explosion in last January's CHRONICLE, we explained how the waves coming from an earth-jar are propagated. At the time, the ultimate causes of the disturbances being known, this was the only problem to be studied. In natural earthquakes the ultimate cause is the first subject of inquiry. As is well known, scientists admit that this cause is either a subterranean explosion, connected with volcanic action, or a sudden bodily movement of large areas of the earth's surface, due probably to the contraction of the inner mass. These movements, when made gradually, do not produce any noticeable disturbance, but if the earth's crust resists the contractions, and the force accumulates, the yielding finally takes place with great crushing and fissures. To these two causes, at different times and on different occasions, the production of earthquakes is attributed; and to the latter, in our opinion, the earthquake at Charleston is due. The first confirmation of this statement may be found in the fact that the shock coincided with a very high tide arising from the combined action of sun and moon on the day of the solar eclipse of August 29th. This tide must have produced a very high pressure all along the coast. Moreover, it is an accepted opinion in geology that there is a line of weakness in the earth's crust, starting from North Carolina and going somewhat in the direction of Toronto. It is not surprising, then, that a force accumulated near Charleston, perhaps for a long time, caused the recent disturbance. Another confirmation may be had from the chemical analysis of some specimens,—for which we are indebted to a friend—taken from the fissures near Charleston. They were found to consist mostly of silicates of sodium, potassium and aluminium, with traces of

iron oxide and calcium phosphate—in other words, of sand and mud; giving, therefore, no sign of volcanic action. We found in them no sulphur, though according to some accounts the presence of sulphur in the air after the shock was perceptible. The same conclusion seems to be indicated by a singular feature connected with the earthquake. The artesian well which supplies the reservoir of Charleston, and which is said to have a depth of over 1500 feet, showed no change of flow or temperature.

The manner of propagation of these earth waves, however incomplete our knowledge of their causes may be, seems to be better known. They moved more rapidly in a direction almost north and south, or in the direction of the line of weakness, than from east to west. They were consequently elliptical with the major axis of the ellipse lying along the direction of the line of weakness. It was furthermore noticed that at different places the intensity of the tremor was different, and that it was wholly unperceived in places situated between districts very badly shaken. This apparent anomaly will find an easy explanation in the geological formation of such places. They are areas of solid formation isolated from others by soft areas incapable, on account of their want of elasticity, of conveying the earth waves. Another phenomenon generally attending earthquakes on the coast, but fortunately absent in this case, is the advance of great sea-waves. Their formation is very easily explained: when the shock comes, the ocean-bottom is lifted up or slips down, and a great mass of water is hurled one way or other with force enough to sweep every obstacle from its path. Its absence in the present instance is, we presume, due to the fact that the earth waves, starting inland, ran towards the ocean; hence if the water wave was formed it would have been noticed only at sea.

At the present date of writing (September 15th), no further scientific remarks on this subject seem to be called for; should some new facts throwing light on the nature of the phenomena be made known, we shall return to the subject. We will merely add that no scientific ground can be assigned for the prediction of another earthquake on September 29th. It is true that about that time the sun and moon will again be in conjunction, and Mars will be in the same portion of the heavens; but this does not prove anything in favor of such a prediction.

MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

ON the 18th of August the American Association for the Advancement of Science met at Buffalo, and continued in session until the 24th, inclusive. We shall give a brief account of the scientific part of the proceedings, after having made some remarks on the nature of the Association itself. The matter treated in the meetings will give us occasion to

touch on the scientific work that has been done during the last few months.

Nature of the Association.—Like the British Association for the Advancement of Science, after which the American is modelled in its general features, this Association proposes, “by periodical and migratory meetings, to promote intercourse between those who are cultivating science in different parts of America, to give a stronger and more general impulse and more systematic direction to scientific research, and to procure for the labors of scientific men increased facilities and a wider usefulness.”

The Association, besides a few Patrons,—at present there are only three,—who are classed as such when they give the sum of one thousand dollars or more, is composed of Members and Fellows. The former are elected by the standing committee upon the written recommendations of two members. From among these the same committee elect by ballot the Fellows, or such persons as are by profession engaged in science, or have by their labors aided in its advancement. The number of Fellows is necessarily more limited than that of Members; at present it is about six hundred, while the Members in July of this year numbered nearly two thousand.

The Association is divided into many small societies, or rather sections. Each Section is composed of Members who apply themselves to the same branch of scientific research. According to the present arrangement, the Sections embrace the following studies: Mathematics and Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, Mechanical Science, Geology and Geography, Biology, Anthropology, Economic Science and Statistics. Each one of the Sections is presided over by a vice-president and has its own secretary, while the whole Association has a president, a general and assistant secretary, besides the permanent secretary, Professor F. W. Putnam, of Cambridge, Mass., and treasurer, W. Lilly, of Mauch Chunk, Pa. All these officers, except the last two, are elected every year by a standing committee comprising the past presidents and officers of both the preceding and actual meeting.

The Proceedings of each meeting are printed, but it is to be regretted that the distribution of these publications cannot be made earlier. Without them no one can have a thorough knowledge of what has been accomplished in a meeting, for it is not in the general sessions, but in those of the Sections, that the real scientific work is done, and these Sections choose different places for their meetings. Thirty-four volumes of records show how regularly the Association has met in past years, except those between 1861–65. The two most important meetings ever held were that at Boston in 1880, and the one at Philadelphia in 1884. The latter was of special interest, owing to the presence of many members of the British Association, which was convened at Montreal that year.

Meeting at Buffalo.—Buffalo is the only city which has been honored by the presence of the Association three times since 1848; the meetings having taken place there at intervals of ten years, in 1866, 1876 and this year. Notwithstanding the many attractions of this great city, its

easy means of access, the interest shown by the local committee and the prestige of its former successful gatherings, the number of members present did not go beyond one-fourth of the whole body. Those, however, who had the good fortune to be there say that the sessions were most enjoyable. About two hundred papers were read, and though they did not show great originality, and contained no important discoveries, nearly all of them were of sufficient interest to command the attendance of not only members of the Association, but of ladies and gentlemen living in Buffalo.

Address of Professor H. A. Newton.—On the morning of the 18th of August, in the first general session, some preliminary business was settled, and in the evening the real work was taken up. It was during the second general session of the day that Professor Newton, the retiring president, gave his address, which by competent men has been declared the most prominent feature of the Buffalo meeting.

Unlike many of his predecessors, and contrary to the custom followed by the presidents of the British Association, Professor Newton, instead of a general subject, took a special one, which has been, perhaps, the most important study of his life—Meteorites, Meteors and Shooting Stars. Were justice done it, we should give the entire paper, or at least a longer account than our space will allow. We shall attempt the following synopsis, which will enable the reader, we think, to form an idea of its merits.

Having stated the facts generally admitted by scientific men about those luminous phenomena, he proves that meteors cannot be produced otherwise than by solid bodies, which, in virtue of their own motion, enter our atmosphere and become luminous by their friction with the air. Contrary to the opinion of some scientists, he holds that the *shooting stars*, or meteors, which may be noticed any clear night, and the *star showers*, or luminous displays, which occur at certain times—one of them took place November 27th, 1885—are of the same origin, and that from either meteors or luminous displays come the meteorites we find on the earth's surface. From the study of many specimens, as also by theoretic deductions, he surmises that the average size of meteoric bodies is rather small; and hence he scouts the opinion of Meyer and others who believe that the preservation of the calorific energy of the sun may come from the fall of such bodies into its surface.

Passing to the origin of meteoric matter, Professor Newton holds that it cannot be due to the sun or the earth's volcanic eruptions, nor to the planets proper or the moon, and therefore concludes that it must be of cometary formation. Moreover, he assumes that comets themselves are condensed from nebulous matter, and this matter may come from the outer portions of the original solar nebula, or from nebula distinct from it.

Papers of the Sections.—We would go beyond the limits of our space were we to attempt a minute analysis of all the papers; moreover, the subject matter of some of them would prove most uninteresting to the general reader. Therefore we propose to select only those that con-

tain new results of science. We may mention for the Section of Mathematics and Astronomy the paper of Professor B. A. Gould, of Cambridge, on the "Photographic Determination of Stellar Position." Twice already we have had occasion to mention in our "Chronicle" the great assistance that Photography has of late afforded Astronomy. We have here a new instance of it. Dr. Gould, after briefly recalling the history of celestial photography, states the work he himself did while he was in charge of the Observatory of Cordova, Argentine Republic. He succeeded in securing nearly fourteen hundred photographic plates of southern star clusters, and he is now engaged in a long work, a reduction of the results, which, no doubt, will increase our knowledge of the southern stars, at present much less known than those of our own hemisphere.

Mr. Chandler's paper on "A Comparative Estimate of Methods and Results in Stellar Photometry" was attentively listened to, and called forth great discussion. Mr. Chandler tried to substantiate by a remarkable number of results the unexpected and, to some, startling statement, that the attempts to determine the relative brightness of the stars, made of late by experimental photometry, had all proved failures and had not disclosed a more uniform scale of magnitude than Argelander's, who, by estimates of the naked eye, determined the stellar magnitudes.

Physics.—Mr. Mendenhall reported the progress which had been made in the study of atmospheric electricity. He noted also a phenomenon, entirely new to him, which happens in the use of resistance coils. He says when a current passes for some time through such coils, upon short circuiting, a reverse current is found to pass through them. The presence of this last current may doubtless be classed under the general head of polarization, but by simple polarization it would be difficult to account for its continuance there for hours.

To the surprise of many, only two papers on electricity were given in this section, and this certainly was not owing to any lack of matter. Perhaps the following little items may interest and please those of our readers who use the electric light. An eminent oculist, after examining the eyes of one thousand one hundred persons who work by the incandescent electric light, failed to find any injurious effects, while it seems that the arc light, at close range and used for long work, is very apt to injure the eye. From a hygienic point of view, either the incandescent or arc light is better than common gas for lighting large rooms. After elaborate experiments made in a Munich theatre, Dr. Breslauer states that gas-light rendered the air of that hall four times as impure as electric light.

Among the most important papers on chemical subjects was that of Professor C. F. Mabery, of Cleveland, Ohio, on "The Decomposition of Certain Products of the Cowles' Electric Furnaces." At last year's meeting at Ann Arbor he contributed a paper on the "Electrical Furnaces," an abstract of which may be seen in the records of that date. In the issue of last January we gave an account of the electrical furnace, and in the last number returned to the same subject, alluding to the new

results obtained. Professor Mabery gives an account of more recent progress. Omitting his controversial remarks on some criticisms by European scientists who had attacked the new method of metallurgy, we may notice that the most remarkable products of the furnace are due especially to the enlargement of the plant, which will receive a still greater development in Lockport, N. Y., by the use of the great Brush dynamo Colossus, built expressly for the purpose. Mr. B. H. Thurston described the new dynamo as the greatest ever built, which has, perhaps, five times the capacity of Edison's famous "Jumbo," that attracted so much attention during the Electrical Exhibition at Philadelphia, in 1884. The Colossus dynamo, when worked at its full power, has a capacity of 300,000 Watts, or is equivalent to 5,000 incandescent lamps of 16 candle power each, and is capable of producing in the electrical furnace enormous heat. The efficiency of these furnaces, even with the present dynamos, may be greatly increased by coating the coarsely powdered charcoal with lime, and thus prevent its conversion into graphite. By this means we get much better products than formerly, among late ones an aluminium iron alloy, resulting from the reduction of aluminium in presence of iron.

Geology.—The papers on Niagara Falls, read so near the famous spot, necessarily proved popular. By a thoughtful choice they were read before the excursion to the great cataract took place, and thus the excursionists were able to verify for themselves the arguments brought forward. Dr. Pohlman, of Buffalo, N. Y., described the district which was to be visited, and, indeed, every tourist should read in full his paper, to understand the lessons that the earth's strata teach us about this wonderful place. Messrs. Woodward and Gilbert, of the Geological Survey, the former having just finished the survey of the Horseshoe Falls, gave in very interesting papers their estimates of the age of the Falls. Professor E. W. Claypole's discourse completed the account, and after him a few others took part in the open discussion. All seemed to be of one mind, and held to the theory that during the glacial epochs Lakes Erie and Ontario formed but one body of water with a much higher level than at present. When the ice began to break and melt, the overflow must have taken a southern direction. And if a dam of twenty-five feet can even now cause an overflow of Lakes Erie, Huron and Michigan past Chicago into the Mississippi, the glaciers certainly must have been able to produce the same effect. As the ice gradually left the St. Lawrence, Lake Ontario fell to the present level, and the surplus waters of Lake Erie took the course they now hold. Comparing the results of the surveys of 1842 and 1872 with those of the last one, it was found that the Falls, at the deepest part of the curve, had retreated about 5 feet per annum, while the whole Horseshoe Falls had receded only one-half that much. It was announced that hereafter exact surveys would be made at shorter intervals of time. From the data at hand, supposing that the rate of erosion was uniform, the learned gentlemen concluded that it must have taken seven thousand years for the Falls to recede from Lewiston to the present spot.

Biology.—Dr. D. E. Salmon, of Washington, D. C., read two papers on "Immunity from a Second Attack of Germ Disease." There are, said the doctor, three explanations: "First, something is deposited in the body which is unfavorable to the germ. Second, something is withdrawn from it which is necessary for the development of the germ. Third, the tissues have acquired such a tolerance for the germ, or for an accompanying poison, that they are not affected by it." Dr. Salmon inclined towards the last hypothesis, and, indeed, it seems to agree with recent well-proved facts, among others with Pasteur's method of inoculation against hydrophobia. This brings to our mind that the committee appointed by the English Government to examine into this method has reported in favor of it, and that many prominent doctors, after much hesitation, are now pronounced followers of Pasteur. We may add, too, and in our opinion it shows the value of his discovery, that some, not daring to deny its importance, pretend that Pasteur has only revived an old method used in France during the great plague some four centuries ago, and in Italy at the end of the last century.

Anthropology.—Vice-president H. Hale, of Clinton, Ontario, Can., read a paper on "The Origin of Languages and the Antiquity of Speaking Man." After the fashion of most scientists of the present day, he made his profession of Darwinism, and like them, too, he could give no truly scientific reason for his belief. Mr. Hale has peculiar ideas on the theory of evolution, and though he tried to follow the lead of other pronounced Darwinists, he openly contradicted them, as well as himself. Take this admission of his, that man "is somewhere between six and ten thousand years old," how does he reconcile it with the doctrine of the Master Evolutionist? And the admission is stronger and more valuable when he asserts that "this man who thus appeared was not a being of feeble powers, a dull-witted savage on the mental level of the degenerate Australian or Hottentot of our day. He possessed and manifested, from the first, intellectual faculties of the highest order, such as none of his descendants have surpassed." Surely this must be the Adam of our Bible. But how did this splendid being come to exist? He says that he had *precursors*, whom others call men; he, however, refuses them that name. 'Tis a strange freak to admit this fact, and stickle at a mere name! But we shall no longer dwell on the examination of Mr. Hale's inconsistent views.

We shall conclude with the following extract of a novel and ingenious method of getting an insight into the unconscious mechanism of authorship, which was described by Mr. Mendenhall under the title, "Characteristic Curves of Composition." The method consists in "counting the number of words of each length, from one letter to fourteen, fifteen, or as long as were found, plotting the result on a curve, in which the abscissæ represented the number of letters in a word, and the ordinates the number of words per thousand of each length. It was shown that while the curves resulting from each thousand words was not entirely regular, that resulting from five thousand was more regular, and that from ten thousand almost entirely so. The inference from this was, that

the phenomenon which the curve represented was a regular one, and that it was an expression of a peculiar vocabulary of the author. Moreover, by comparing the respective curves one would be able to judge whether two works were written by the same author, and perhaps even decide the controversy whether Bacon wrote Shakspeare Curves derived from Dickens ('*Oliver Twist*') and Thackeray ('*Vanity Fair*') were remarkably similar, thus suggesting that the subject-matter might cause the peculiarity of the curve, while those of John Stuart Mill ('*Political Economy*' and '*Essay on Liberty*') differed from them in having more long words and fewer short ones, though words of two letters (prepositions mainly) were most abundant in Mill. The average length of the novelists' words was 4.38, and that of the philosopher 4.8."

Book Notices.

MONOTHEISM, IN THE MAIN, DERIVED FROM THE HEBREW NATION, AND THE LAW OF MOSES THE PRIMITIVE RELIGION OF THE CITY OF ROME; an Historical Investigation. By the *Rev. Henry Formby*. London: Burns & Oates.

This book is from the pen of an Oxford scholar, who, forty years ago, received the grace to enter the Catholic Church, from which his fathers, in an evil hour, had separated. Subsequently to his reception into the Church, and still responsive to the light and inspirations of those gratuitous aids which the mercy of God copiously offers to the human will, he received the sacrament of Holy Orders. On March 12th, 1884, he died, with the same solid and exemplary piety which had marked his previous life.

The title of his book succinctly states the leading and comprehensive proposition which he has undertaken to prove. Nor is it merely the Monotheism, which is known to the natural and unaided reason of man, that the Reverend author desires to claim as the original possession and inheritance of the city of Romulus. His purpose is more specialized, since he makes the characteristic mark of this Monotheism consist in being in the main a derivation "from the Hebrew Nation and the Law of Moses"—a quite important aspect of his subject, as there may be scholars who, while prepared to admit that a belief in the one true God was the real and distinguishing religion of primordial Rome, yet do not perceive sufficient evidence to grant the conclusion that this belief was mainly of Israelitish and Scriptural derivation. These scholars would, doubtless, defend their skepticism respecting this point by an appeal to two arguments: (1) That the historical records are too meagre and imperfect to allow of ascribing to the outcast and predatory associates of Romulus, and their descendants, so elevated and magnificent a system as the revealed and super-rational doctrines possessed by the Chosen Nation; (2) That natural principles and causes suffice to explain the real nature of the primitive Roman recognition of God as the sole and

supreme object of worship. Human reason, it is argued, is competent to discover the existence and unity of God: "For, by the greatness of the beauty, and of the creature, the Creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby."—(Wisdom. Ch. 13.) Why, then, endeavor to explain, by supernatural and extraordinary causes, that which natural ones are adequate to unfold?

"Nor let a god in person stand display'd,
Unless the laboring plot deserve his aid."

Still, the evidence in favor of a scriptural origin for the primeval Monotheism of the Eternal City becomes, under the patient elaboration of Father Formby, so distinct and undeniable that he does not think "any one will very easily commit himself to the desperate expedient of maintaining the possibility of a public religion of Monotheism having been attainable at that time of the world from any other source except solely from the Hebrew people."—(p. 230.)

But after allowing that the Monotheism of ancient Rome was influenced by the inspired and Mosaic law, scholars might differ widely in their estimate of the degree to which the early Roman religion and its public belief and profession were affected by this cause. Some might ascribe very little influence to it, while others might be disposed to exaggerate its importance. Again, there may be not a few strongly inclined to the opinion that the primitive religion of Rome was not Monotheism at all, but Polytheism, derived from the Trojans in the manner described by Virgil when he makes the ghost of Hector address Æneas thus:

"Now Troy to thee commends her future state,
And gives her gods companions of thy fate;
From their assistance happier walls expect,
Which, wand'ring long, at last thou shalt erect."¹

In the chain of evidence, which connects primeval Rome's belief in the true and supreme *Numen Cæleste* with the inspired truths delivered to the Chosen People by the Hebrew prophets, an indispensable link is the precise and circumstantial testimony of St. Clement of Alexandria, "a convert, at an advanced age, from the philosophical school of Greece." St. Clement says, in his "Stromata" (1-xv): "Numa, the King of the Romans, was a Pythagorean, and, assisted by the doctrines derived from Moses, he prohibited the Romans from making an image of God in the likeness of either a man or a beast. The Romans, for the first hundred and seventy years, during which they built temples, did not make a single sculptured or painted image, for Numa had instructed them, after the manner of a secret doctrine, in the truth that it is impossible to attain to the worship of the Most High in any other way than by the mind alone."

In the presence of this distinct and unqualified avouchment by one of such incontestable authority as St. Clement for information and veracity, it would be a clear irrelevancy, if nothing worse, to attempt the employment of any skeptical and pseudo-critical methods of historical investigation, for the purpose of diminishing either the force and fulness, or the accuracy, of his testimony.

It may, however, be observed, in passing, that the motive of "con-

¹ "Sacra suosque tibi commendat Troja penates;
Hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quære
Magna, pererrato statuas quæ denique ponto."

—*Æneid*, lib. ii.

scious bad faith," imputed by our Reverend author to the historian, Tacitus, for his silence respecting the Mosaic origin of the primitive Latin cult, is purely supposititious.

Father Formby, it will be observed, considers the Monotheistic creeds of the Ancient World, in whatever country and race existing, to be a derivation from the tradition and accurate ethical knowledge of Noah, when they are not directly taken from the Jewish people and the Scriptures. "The religion of Monotheism," he insists, "must ever be essentially one and the same, whether it is Hebrew or Roman Monotheism. And though the city of the Gentiles, which can only be in possession of a borrowed light, must stand at a very great disadvantage, as compared with the city and people who have been the object of a special election," etc.

The substance of his sentences, in this connection, may, we take it, be expressed in the thesis that, radically and primitively, the Monotheistic beliefs of the Ancient World originated from the one general source of God's revelation to man. We are not quite sure that we can under all respects agree with the doctrine here proposed by the erudite author, and it will, doubtless, occur to the reflecting reader that a distinction should be drawn between Natural and Revealed Religion, indicating their distinct origin, respective scope, and legitimate meaning. To assert that the systems of worship in which supreme homage is paid to the one true God are all of revealed origin, does not seem to be entirely consistent with the facts of profane history, nor in sufficient accord with the exact and descriptive narration which St. Paul publishes to the Romans. This great Apostle declares that "when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by *nature* those things that are of the law, these having not the law are a law to themselves."

It was thus to the peculiar credit of the Gentiles that they by nature performed the works which are "of the law," following the light of the supreme and authoritative rule of action impressed upon their rational natures. The Apostle here contrasts the law, *i.e.*, the written and Mosaic law, with nature, and clearly discriminates between those who are in possession of the law and those who are guided solely by the natural light of reason. It is true, the Apostle distinctly attributes, in this connection, a saving and supernatural character to the light and operations of nature; a character clearly such as can belong only to nature influenced and quickened by vital and infused grace, which is never denied to sincere and inquiring souls.¹

The power ascribed by St. Paul to the Gentile religion, of being efficacious in respect to man's real and ultimate destiny, should not, however, be confused with the religious knowledge and works which proceed from, and are totally included in, nature as their principle, reason and the divinely-revealed truths being two simply distinct sources of certainty and operation.

But side-issues apart, it is quite sure that the present work is a scholarly and sober contribution to the religious history of ancient Rome. It contains, at the same time, an antidote for those popular and skeptical delusions, agreeably to which a major portion of all historical events recorded of the early Latin city and people are reduced to the order of myths and spurious marvels; or else it is deemed, in respect to the reality of their occurrence, that they must be classed as merely inter-

¹ "Facienti quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam."—Theologi passim. "God does not deny grace to any one who diligently employs the natural means in his power to rectitude and justice."

esting probabilities, for that, after the most rigid and complete investigation of reliable records, an insuperable *on ne sait quoi* intervenes, over which they cannot rise to the domain of received history. Such a condition of mind in the student, or searcher after truth, reveals an absolute mistrust of genuine historical documents, and is really a species of that irrational skepticism which was introduced into the thoughts of men through the subtle sophistries of Hume.

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY. By Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

This is a scholarly and entertaining volume, covering the first eight centuries of the Church's existence. Its tone throughout is temperate and candid, and although the Rev. author has not designed to produce a "popular" book, he has, nevertheless, completed a volume of more than usual interest to the average reader, and really valuable to the genuine student of ecclesiastical history. He discovers, in all his pages, the actual power, as well as earnest determination to set forth, without partisan coloring, the real facts of this historical period, as they actually happened, and not as they might have occurred in conformity with any preconceived and baseless theory of past events. The set purpose of accurate and truthful narration is the more commendable, in view of the circumstance that the Rev. author has thus avoided the cherished and characteristic delusion of certain writers, who appear to aim at unfolding the scroll of history by *a priori* methods, such as we may suppose an angel of heaven might employ, in the event of his possessing that species of infused knowledge preceding its objects and underived from them, which is attributed to him in St. Augustine's theory of Angelic cognition. But so elevated and independent a manner of knowing, and hence of imparting the knowledge of objects, is far above anything that man can accomplish, at least in his present and sublunary state, in which real objects and events are known only *a posteriori*.

Dr. Parsons judiciously establishes, in the opening pages of his work, that corner stone of ecclesiastical history, the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter. Those without the pale of the Catholic and Roman Church have made the assertion that it was "the ambition of the Roman See" which "gave rise to the opinion that St. Peter was its founder." This charge is validly refuted by Dr. Parsons' direct and unambiguous statement of those facts and circumstances which rest upon incontestable authorities, and show, with complete evidence, that St. Peter resided in the Eternal City, was bishop, and exclusively Pope of Rome.

After a brief, yet thorough consideration of St. Peter's Papal supremacy, Dr. Parsons next reviews the heresies of the first three centuries. The first heretic preserved in the records of Christian annals was Simon, who, from his profession of, and proficiency in, the art of magic, was surnamed *Magus*, *i. e.*, the magician. He it was who tried to purchase from the Apostles, with money, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and who became, by this means, the cause of the Church's introducing into her vocabulary the hitherto unknown term of "Simony." The doctrines he invented and delivered dogmatically to his followers are of so preposterous a character that it is difficult to imagine how his disciples could have been brought to believe in them, unless we suppose that an unreasoning and fatuous credulity was excited and produced in their minds by the prodigies he wrought subserviently to the art of magic and the power of the devil. He blasphemously asserted that "it was he who had . . . appeared to the Jews in the guise of the Son of God ;

that he had descended at Samaria, as the Father, and that the other peoples knew him as the Holy Ghost. He was always accompanied by a Tyrian woman, named Helen, who had been a common prostitute, and his followers must have been especially interested in her, when they were informed that she was the same Helen who had caused the siege of Troy."¹ "She was declared to be the first conception of his divine mind, and the mother of all men." She was detained on the earth, he alleged, by reason of the love which the fallen angels had conceived for her, and he may have intended it to be supposed that these pure, but malignant spirits had swiftly perceived her inaccessible charms and beauty, and had fallen an easy victim to their influence.

But from Simon's prodigious skill in magic, and from the preternatural marvels ascribed to him, it may be legitimately concluded, and the conclusion is explicitly stated by reliable writers of that day, that Simon met with peculiar success in spreading his errors and deluding the minds of men, to the point of making them his admiring and obsequious disciples. He must have been deeply and incurably versed in the black art, or rather aided in a special and singular manner by evil and superhuman power, when "Nero and some of the first people of Rome succumbed to his illusions."² But having ranged himself in the ranks of revolt set up by Lucifer against the Creator of Angels and of men, he was brought to a tragic and ignoble death through the prayers of St. Peter, whilst he was attempting to prove his divinity by flying through the air.

Simon Magus, as well as his follower, Saturnine, appears to have held, in respect to the origin of the world and of men, a theory which agrees in an essential principle with the one now advocated by the extreme adherents of Agnostic Evolution.

The primeval heretics unite with our evolutionary theorists in denying to God the production from nothing of the visible universe, including the rational inhabitants of our planet; for the creation of these objects was referred to the Angels by these pioneers of error. Modern agnostics, too, refuse to trace back the line of real causes and effects to the point where the First and Creative Cause must be introduced, to account for the providential existence of all secondary realities; and to justify this capricious and illogical method of declining to satisfy the clear and impartial demands of reason, they appeal to their profound ignorance of objects, and modes of production, so alien to the sphere of common experience and known physical laws. Their defence, in short, is an appeal to their blank and agnostic condition of mind respecting the Unknowable.

Later on in the volume, Dr. Parsons discusses the time when Christianity was first introduced into England. Lingard says that "at the distance of so many ages, it is impossible to discover by whom Christianity was first preached in the island."³ Some writers have endeavored to show that St. Peter was the first to break ground in this new field; while others have thought that the honor belonged to St. Paul. Lingard attaches no importance to either of these opinions. But whatever may be the real facts of the case, it is historically settled that Christianity acquired a strong foothold, and flourished in Britain during the reign of Lucius, the great-grandson of Caractacus, about the year 182. The rude and uncultivated Britons were long undisturbed by the controversies and heresies which arose and exerted their baneful effect upon the older

¹ Studies in Church History, p. 27.

³ History of England, vol. i. Chap. i.

² Ibid. pp. 27-28.

and more polished contemporaries of the East. Heresies in abundance had sprung up in the Oriental countries, and had well-nigh spent their violent and ephemeral force, before the Isles of Britain became, about the year 405, the scene of a dark and blighting Pelagianism which denied the necessity of Divine grace for man upon the assumption that he is not born in original sin.

Before concluding the notice of the volume before us, it is expedient to observe that many occasions arise in the work of Dr. Parsons for using extracts from authorities who have written in foreign languages. The English translation of these extracts, so far as our observation has extended, is accurate; but the regret may be expressed that in several instances a higher degree of smoothness and ease has not always been attained consistently with accuracy. We refer especially to what Dr. Hugh Blair styles "inversions" in the structure of sentences, and to what he illustrates by the example, "Into this hole thrust themselves three Roman Senators."

It is not possible, in the space allotted to us, to enter upon a consideration of any other topics developed in "*Studies in Church History*," but we think it only fair to add that the thoughtful pages of Dr. Parsons' book have placed it conveniently within the power of any reader or student to form a close and correct acquaintance with the history of the Church, and the vicissitudes through which she passed, during the first eight centuries of her career.

THE MOTHER OF THE KING. MARY DURING THE LIFE OF OUR LORD. By Henry James Coleridge, of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates, New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1886.

This work is a proper supplement to the many excellent volumes which its distinguished author has composed and published on different periods of the life of our Blessed Redeemer, or, rather, it proves a very important part of that series. For, as we are told in Sacred Scripture that when "the wise men from the East," led by the star to the place "where the Holy Babe was, they found the Child, *with Mary, His Mother*," we may truly infer that her life was closely interwoven with His, and that the devout study of one will reflect light upon the other. For the Life of our Lady is in one a part of the Life of our Lord, and cannot be separated from it. And it is mainly because of the persistent endeavor of Protestants to sunder what God has joined together,—the Life of our Lord and the Life of our Lady,—that a false conception so generally exists among them as to the position, and office, and work of that Blessed Mother in the Kingdom of her Son. And it is owing to the same cause that so many of them who honestly intend to accept and believe the dogmatic declarations and teachings of the ancient Creeds and Fathers of the Church, respecting the incarnation, and the divine and human natures of our Blessed Redeemer and the unity of His Person, yet accept them merely as barren and unfruitful facts, and having no intimate and necessary relation to our Divine Lord's mission and work, nor to His Church and Kingdom. Hence, while such persons are orthodox as respects their acceptance of the language and outward form of the declarations and definitions of the ancient Œcumenical Creeds, they have no real understanding of their interior meaning, and of their bearing upon, and inseparable connection with, other parts of Christian belief and doctrine.

It is owing to the same lamentable fact, too, that even in the Protestant sects, which are "orthodox" as respects their professed adherence

to the Church's declared dogmas on these subjects, a vast majority of their members (and among these many of their most prominent ministers) have, in reality, consciously or unconsciously, adopted the heretical notions of the Monophysites, of the Nestorians, or of the Arians, or a heterogeneous mixture of them all.

The concise declaration of a distinguished Protestant theologian (whether original with him in the particular form in which he formulated it we know not) is entirely and emphatically true: "He who hesitates to call Mary 'The Mother of God,' with full belief in all that the title implies, stumbles at the Mystery of the Incarnation." Yet this the vast majority of Protestants do, and hence their lack of intelligent, complete, and fruitful belief in the Incarnation, and in all that radiates from it. And hence, the tendency among them (which many of their more earnest and thoughtful ministers acknowledge and lament) to explain away, if not openly deny, the profound truths which grow forth from, and cluster around this central fundamental mystery of the life and religion of Christ.

But, turning away from this, there is a lesson for Catholics in the intimate relation of the Life of our Lady to the Life of our Blessed Redeemer, which they cannot too diligently and earnestly study. Her position, during the life of our Lord, must be regarded and considered as the foundation of the position she afterwards held, and holds, and ever will hold in His Kingdom. Therefore it is very important that we should have a true conception of what the position of Mary during the Public Life of Our Lord was, and how that position itself was the fruit of all that she saw and did, and gained during the Holy Infancy, and the Hidden Life, as well as the foundation of all that afterwards Mary was to be and is.

These are the leading thoughts of the author of the volume before us, the clues which have guided him in his studies of "Mary During the Life of Our Lord."

As the author pertinently says, "the Gospel narratives of the earliest years of our Lord are full of our Blessed Lady." But the part of Gospel history which deals with our Divine Lord's Public Life "makes only a few, and, as it seems, occasional mentions of her." But there is nothing in the divinely ordered history which is only "occasional," in the common sense of the word. For every word and sentence in the divinely inspired Scriptures has been written with a divinely inspired purpose and meaning, sometimes obvious and at other times hidden, that is, hidden from the multitude; but as time rolls on, brought out and revealed, as to their interior meaning, to the few devout souls who, by constant, reverential, profound reflection and meditation and adoration, merit such special revelations.

But, while this is true, it is a fact that ought to be plainly obvious to all readers of the Sacred Scriptures, that the Life of our Blessed Lady was a continuous and most beautiful whole, "a path of justice," like a shining light, going forward, and ever increasing more and more unto the perfect day.

Consequently, the writer of the volume before us consistently says: "It is in harmony with these truths that we should be ready to believe that, during the latter portion of the Life of our Lady, that which ensued after the Ascension of our Lord, she should have had a position and a work in the Kingdom which He had founded, which might be said to grow out of what she was in the Public Life, and in the Holy Infancy" of our Blessed Redeemer before His Public Life began.

Of this latter portion of the Life of our Lady the author does not

treat. The volume before us is confined to a study of her Life up to the eve of the Resurrection. It concludes "with the solemn pause before that glorious fact." For, as the author well says, "The Resurrection was, in truth, the beginning of the new Kingdom, of which the Forty Days were the immediate earthly inauguration, as the Ascension was itself the opening mystery in Heaven above."

The author hopes to make the subsequent portion of the Life of our Lady, and her relation to the Church and Kingdom of Christ, the subject of another volume. It is to be earnestly desired that his hope will be realized.

GERMAN PSYCHOLOGY OF TO-DAY; THE EMPIRICAL SCHOOL. By Th. Ribot, Director of the "Revue Philosophique." Translated from the Second French Edition, by James M. Baldwin, B.A., late Fellow of Princeton College. With a Preface by James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., Lit. D. 8vo, pp. xxi, 307. New York: Ch. Scribner's Sons, 1886.

The arguments by which Positivists seek to prove the invalidity of Metaphysics and the mind's incapability of knowing fundamental truth, and to make Science the mental expression of the relations existing between mere phenomena, when thoroughly sifted, are found to contain their own refutation. It may be on this ground that President McCosh, the veteran foe of Positivism and defender of fundamental truth, introduces, with so much comity, M. Ribot's decidedly positivistic book to English readers. Be this as it may, the French author is far from showing like courtesy to his American introducer. Mr. McCosh, if we may judge him by his latest work, still adheres to the old school of psychology, and of that school M. Ribot speaks in no polite terms, "Though it has cut a good figure enough," he says, "the old psychology is doomed. In the new surroundings that have recently grown up, the conditions of its existence have disappeared. Its methods do not suffice for the increasing difficulties of the task, for the growing exigencies of the scientific spirit. . . . Feeble and old, it makes no progress, and asks only to be let alone, that it may spend its age in peace" (p. 1-2). "It presents a character that is narrow, and, to speak it in a word, childish. It lacks air and horizon," etc. (p. 4). For the *New Psychology*, however, M. Ribot shows high admiration and strong hope. Though still of tender growth, it casts aside all metaphysical leading strings, and throws itself on the safe support and guidance of the natural sciences. The sad "mistake of the old psychology has been that it accepted such creations of the natural consciousness as spirit, reason, intellection, for definite truths. The soul, instead of being considered simply as a logical subject to which we attribute all the facts of internal experience as predicates, has become a real being, a substance, manifested in 'faculties'" (p. 11). This blunder the new psychology is careful to shun. It studies facts only with their relations, seeks particulars, not generalities. "Its domain is, therefore, specific. It has for its object nervous phenomena, accompanied by consciousness. . . The soul and its faculties disappear, and we have to do only with internal events which, as sensations and mental images, translate physical events, or which, as ideas, movements, volition, and desire, are translated into physical events" (p. 8). Such is the present work of the new psychology, but see the bright promise of its future,— "when realizing a progress that it does not dream of now, it succeeds in determining the conditions of all mental action, of whatever sort, as well of pure thought as of perception and movement, then psychology will be *entirely* physiological, and it will be well indeed" (p. 15).

These citations, selected at random, from a large mass of like ranting, will suffice to show the author's "advanced views" as a psychologist. It would be manifestly out of place here to enter into a discussion of these "views." Luckily, they make but the chaff. Those who know how to winnow the good grain which lies in its historical part, will find the work interesting and highly useful. To students of the Scholastic Philosophy it will be of special service. Though insisting on the empiric method as the point of departure in psychological study, the schoolmen, through lack of mechanical instruments, could not always make their observations and experiments as thorough and minute as such assistance would have enabled their making them.

Had microscopes and "psychic laboratories" existed in the days of Aristotle, Bl. Albert, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Suarez, the field of so-called empirical psychology would, doubtless, have been as patiently explored as it has been in modern Germany. Now that recent invention has given us new "external senses," the Christian Philosophy will be alive to what they reveal regarding the phenomena in the lower forms of psychic action, and will know how to make the *laws* thence induced, *principles* from which to make new deductions, whereby to enrich the present wealth of conclusions which constitute the contents of its *science* of the human *soul*. M. Ribot, therefore, by bringing together in convenient summary the results of German research in this department of psychology, has done a service to Catholic philosophy. His work covers the entire literature of the subject. Tracing the rise of the empiric movement with Herbart, he sketches the main features of that writer's psychology, his so-called "*Statics*," and "*Mechanics of Mind*," and his influence in the school which succeeded him. The pertinent parts of Lotze's *Medicinische Psychologie* with its famous *Theory of Local Signs*; the nativists (Müller, Weber, Stumpf), and empiricists (Helmholtz, Wundt), *Theories on The Origin of the Notion of Space*; Fechner's and Weber's interesting discoveries in the Measurement of Sensations; Wundt's exhaustive work on Physiological Psychology; a Treatise on the Duration of Psychic Acts: these points mark the main contents of the book. The author's patience in amassing the fruits of his wide reading is the more to be admired that the greater part had to be drawn from uncongenial atmosphere. Not one of the greatest names (Herbart, Lotze, Fechner, Wundt), whose theories fill his pages, marks a mere empiricist. All of them are infected by the "metaphysical spirit."

Whether English reading students have reason "to be grateful to have M. Ribot's work in their own tongue" (p. vii.), may be doubted. Our positivistic literature is already too rich, and students who are likely to *profit* by the merits of this late accession might have drawn from the French source. But though we may question the desirability of the translation, we cannot find fault with the style in which it has been made. Save an occasional obscurity, almost inseparable from a work of its kind, nothing better could be asked in the way of rendering.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH RHETORIC: PRECEPTS AND EXERCISES.
By Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J., author of "The Art of Oratorical Composition."
New York: The Catholic Publication Soc. Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1886.

We have received this second volume on Rhetoric, from the pen of Father Coppens. Together with "The Art of Oratorical Composition," which appeared last year, this forms a thorough course for the use of our colleges and seminaries. As was apparent in the first volume, so here,

we find the educator everywhere animating the preceptor. Not only are the principles laid down according to a clearly marked system, and the definitions exact, but what strikes one most forcibly, in looking over the pages of this "Introduction," is the judgment and good taste shown in the selection of the illustrations and examples from model writers. These are evidently the fruit of extensive and careful reading, regulated by the wish of being really useful in the class-room. There is nothing stereotyped about them, whilst the names in general represent the purest and best authors in our language, and we are taught the particular quality of their excellence. Father Coppens does not shrink from warning against popular names. Whether he points out the brilliant exaggerations of Macaulay's criticisms, or condemns the prudery of society, in ostentatiously avoiding the use of certain excellent English words, or maintains good sense against the exalted culture of Emerson, or Matthew Arnold, everywhere we discover that same respect for truth of every kind, and that moderation which make the educator's power of fixing impressions upon his pupils for good.

We have taken some of the most popular and approved text books, in use in our best schools, and compared them with this new "Introduction to English Rhetoric." The result is in every way—and in some parts to an exceptionable degree—favorable to the latter.

Take, of the more important instances, the chapter on History. It is a subject which, for many reasons, requires, more than most branches of a liberal education, a careful tutoring. In the very brief space which Quackenbos devotes to the matter, he states that a history, to be good, must be *true*. Farther on, he says: "The English language has produced many historians of the first rank; among whom Robertson, Hume, and Gibbon." "American literature can boast three names equally great: Bancroft, Hildreth, and Prescott." We all know how eagerly most of the above works are read by our youth, who, unfortunately, acquire little of their style and much of their fatal sentiments. If truth—which implies the use only of authentic documents, accuracy of statement, and absence of false prejudice—be requisite in a historian, how, then, can we allow our children to look up, as to historians of the first rank, to Hume, of whom Father Coppens reminds us that he "so misrepresents many facts as to instil infidelity;" to Gibbon, "who labors to undermine Christianity;" to Bancroft, "who, while patronizing all religions, inculcates indifferentism to all positive teaching." Surely it is not instructing men—which is the proper object of history,—“to lead them astray on subjects which it is their highest interest to understand aright.” Of Prescott, our author says: "As examples of unreliable documents from which writers have often drawn gross falsehoods, we may mention Limborch and Llorente, who supplied Prescott with most of his misrepresentations."

But let the teacher judge for himself. There are other text books, excellent in point of literary accuracy, and didactic construction, such as Hart's "Composition and Rhetoric," which, if not misleading, as we have instanced Quackenbos to be, are too conservative, aiming at implanting principles upon the mind without anything in the form of applied criticism which might help to educate man. Our "Introduction" has a different and a higher aim. We should not pass by in silence the elaborate chapters on Versification added by Father Brady, S.J. But why the Latin acrostic on p. 287? There hardly appears sufficient reason for putting it there, considering the scope of the book.

On the whole, we earnestly bespeak the patronage of the above work, on the score, simply, of its merits. Unfortunately, it had not appeared

when the learned Committee, appointed by the late Council, drew up a new plan of studies for our Seminaries. We venture to assert that, had they been enabled to examine Father Coppens' book, it would have taken the place of Quackenbos, which is placed on the list, as a guide in English Rhetoric for ecclesiastical students.

CHRISTIAN PATIENCE; THE STRENGTH AND DISCIPLINE OF THE SOUL. A Course of Lectures by *Bishop Ullathorne*. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1886.

This is a very beautiful as well as important work; important and beautiful as regards the subject it treats of and the truths it elucidates, and beautiful as regards the manner and style in which the author expresses his ideas. It is the last of a series of three volumes, the object of which is to explain and inculcate "those fundamental principles of the Christian virtues which, from their profundity, are least understood, but which most contribute to the perfecting of the human soul." The first volume of the series, under the title of the "Endowments of Man," establishes the doctrinal foundations of the Christian virtues. The second, under the title of the "Groundwork of the Christian Virtues," treats, chiefly, of Christian Humility, as being the receptive foundation of the other virtues. The third volume, which is before us, treats of "Christian Patience," as being the positive strength and disciplinary power of the soul. Throughout the whole three volumes, the sovereign virtue of Charity is explained.

In his preface, the author says that in the production of this last volume he has "found much less assistance than in the two previous ones, from the Fathers of the Church and the great spiritual writers," because, as a rule, they have "limited their instructions to that side of the virtue which is exercised under sufferings, and only a limited number of them," among whom are St. Zeus, Tertullian, St. Gregory the Great, St. Bonaventure, and St. Catherine of Siena, "have treated of that most important side of the virtue by which it gives strength and discipline to all the mental and moral powers, and perfection to all the virtues."

The author apologizes, altogether unnecessarily, we think, for frequently recurring to the same principles. He states as his reasons for so doing, "that the only solid way of explaining the virtues is by their principles and mutual connections," and that "to do this effectually requires that the same principles be often repeated, as well to fix them in the mind as to show their connection with practical details, and to give those details greater light."

In arranging the truths which enter into his general subject, the author first treats of The Work of Patience in the Soul; then on the Nature and Object of Christian Patience; then on Patience as a Universal Virtue; and then on Christian Fortitude. Then, as reflecting light both on what he has already said, and has still to say, he devotes a chapter to the Patience of the Son of God. In the chapters which follow, he treats of Patience as the Discipline of the Soul, Patience as the Perfecter of our Daily Duties, Encouragements to Patience, the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, Prayer, Patience in Prayer, and on the Cheerfulness of Patience.

The work abounds in profound, suggestive, fruitful ideas, lucidly and beautifully expressed.

LEAVES FROM ST. AUGUSTINE. By *Mary H. Allies*. Edited by T. W. Allies, K. C.S.G. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1886.

This volume is truly a *multum in parvo*. It is a masterpiece of careful, painstaking, discriminating selection. The amount of labor that must have been expended in selecting from the voluminous works of St. Augustine only enough of what is best to fill less than six hundred pages, when all that he wrote is excellently good, can only be estimated by those who undertake similar, though less difficult, tasks. One of the greatest difficulties encountered by the compiler, unquestionably, must have been that of rejecting rather than collecting what she would employ, from the superabundant material on hand. Nor in the performance of her work has she been under any obligations to previous translators of more or less complete collections of the writings of St. Augustine. An English translation of works of St. Augustine makes up fifteen volumes. The Oxford translation of the Fathers makes several more. But, both together fall far short of containing all the great Saint and Doctor of the Church wrote. As we learn from the preface, by T. W. Allies, her father, the translator and compiler made no use of either of these series. The edition she used was that of the Benedictines, published at Paris in 1679. The choice of the passages selected and the work of translating them are entirely her own.

To persons who have not the means to purchase one of the series of volumes containing collections of St. Augustine's works, or the time to read and study them, this volume will be almost invaluable. Even to those who possess one or another of those collections it will be highly useful. Its title is truthfully suggestive, "Leaves from St. Augustine." They are not leaves gathered at random from the trees he planted, but the most perfect specimen leaves which a keenly discriminating mind with unsparing labor and care could select. They are the pith and marrow of his most valued productions. They will serve, better than any volume that has fallen under our notice, to give the intelligent general reader an idea of "the beauty, the vastness, and the grandeur of mind of one who is said to have acted upon a greater number of men than any one since the time of St. Paul."

ORPHANS AND ORPHAN ASYLUMS. By *Rev. P. A. Bort, L. T. S.* With an Introduction by the Right Rev. C. P. Maes, D.D., Bishop of Covington. Buffalo, N. Y.: Catholic Publication Company.

This is a much needed and an opportune book. The need of Catholic orphan asylums and kindred institutions is increasing among us faster than their enlargement or the establishing of new ones. At the same time the need of more definite and exact ideas of the purposes they should subserve, their true aims and objects, and their proper direction and arrangement, etc., and interior discipline and government, is also increasing.

These needs the work before us is well calculated to supply. It contains brief and concise accounts of the foundation, growth, arrangements and specific objects sought to be attained by all the different orphan asylums in all the Dioceses of the Church in the United States. Along with this are statements of the income, and from what sources obtained, of the various asylums, the number of inmates, the annual expenses, etc. Two hundred and twenty-one institutions are thus mentioned and described.

The concluding chapter contains a number of remarks and reflections

by the author upon the general subject. It also points out how the State has endeavored to copy from the Church, and essays to do the work of charity, but confessedly fails in the attempt. The author points out the cause of this failure, and shows that, while the State ought to assist and furnish funds to sustain the charitable institutions of the Church, yet it can never successfully manage charitable institutions.

The brief Introduction to the work by the Right Rev. Bishop of Covington is an important part of the volume. It sets forth clearly, though concisely, what should be the chief purpose and object of orphan asylums, and insists on its being carefully kept in view. It points out practical mistakes in the location of orphan asylums, their management and discipline, and contains a number of valuable practicable suggestions with respect to all these subjects.

A LAYMAN'S STUDY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE, CONSIDERED IN ITS LITERARY AND SECULAR ASPECT. By Francis Bowen, LL.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1885. 16mo, pp. 145.

A book written in good style, and in which the author's design, *as expressed on his title-page*, is sufficiently well carried out. The so-called religious papers, with incredible blindness, have praised this book as if it were the quintessence of orthodoxy. Had there been a word breathed in it against the pet doctrines of Calvinism, they would have detected it at once and denounced the author accordingly. But they could not see that Mr. Bowen looks on the Bible only as a great classical work of human, not divine, origin. He thinks, indeed, that in some sense the Bible may be said to contain the word of God, inasmuch as great truths are propounded in it as if they came from divine relation (p. 87). But mixed up with these are other ingredients that are merely the outcome of early Hebrew literature. "Such foreign elements may be rightfully subjected to searching examination and criticism, often to disparaging and destructive criticism; since I do not see why Jewish literature should be exempted from the application of such scrutiny any more than the literature of any other nation, say, of the Hindoos or the Greeks" (*Ibid.*). The history of Balaam and Balak is only a legend (p. 102). Correct statistics, plain and exact narratives of fact do not belong to hoar antiquity (p. 103). Moses only imagined that God appeared to him on Horeb (p. 125). We are not blaming the author for pushing his Protestant principles of private judgment to their logical limits. We are only expressing our wonder at the exaggerated praise bestowed on such a book by Presbyterian and other so-called *religious* papers. It shows how little is left of the doctrine of inspiration in the mind of "orthodox" Protestantism; how little, even, of respect for that Holy Book, which was once an object of their idolatry, and which they are fond of changing, and are now despising, hating, and suppressing; whereas, it seems we are the only ones *left* to do it reverence.

SHORT PAPERS FOR THE PEOPLE (Alethaurion). By Rev. Thomas B. Moore, D.D. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. 1886.

It is well worth while to briefly state the particular circumstances out of which this volume grew. During some of the earlier years of his life its author lived in a community that was almost exclusively non-Catholic, but in which religious questions were favorite topics for discussion. It was necessary for him, as a Catholic clergyman, to defend the Faith with which he was identified, and he was consequently frequently engaged in

"intellectual," yet "almost invariably friendly battles with non-Catholics." He found that the works explanatory of the Catholic belief, and also those which were controversial, were too heavy to suit his purpose. It then occurred to him that what were most needed and would be most effective, were statements and arguments, "strong but not stilted, trenchant but not murderous, witty but not uncharitable." Accordingly, in 1873, he began to publish in the *Catholic Advocate* the brief, pithy papers which are included in this volume. The author's object has been to produce a book that would entertain and interest, while, at the same time, it would be instructive and profitable, and one that could be read by every one without any strain upon the mind.

In this, we think, he has succeeded admirably well. His style is familiar, easy and light, his methods of statement are simple and direct; and the result is a book which, treating of many various subjects, is calculated to enlist the interest of non-Catholic readers to a much larger extent than would more pretentious and exhaustive treatises.

The opinion we have thus expressed of the work is fully confirmed, we find, by extracts from a large number of commendatory letters from distinguished Prelates of the Church in England, as well as in this country, among whom is His Eminence Cardinal Newman. They characterize it as "useful," "valuable," "entertaining," "attractive, witty and instructive," "fresh and lively," "pithy," "direct and pungent."

ASCETICAL WORKS OF ST. ALPHONSUS. (The Centenary Edition.)

PREPARATION FOR DEATH, OR CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ETERNAL TRUTHS. USEFUL FOR ALL AS MEDITATIONS, AND SERVICEABLE TO PRIESTS FOR SERMONS; MAXIMS OF ETERNITY AND RULE OF LIFE. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. 1886.

THE WAY OF SALVATION AND OF PERFECTION, MEDITATIONS—PIOUS REFLECTIONS—SPIRITUAL TREATISES. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, 1886.

These two books form the first and second volumes of a new and only complete edition in English of the ascetical and dogmatical works of St. Alphonsus de Liguori. The English translation is based upon the French translation from the Italian, published in twenty-seven volumes, of Fathers Leopold Dujardin and Jules Jaques, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. The works of the Saint on Moral Theology, written by him in Latin, will be untranslated and published in the original text.

In the translated volumes, published and to be published, many of the explanatory notes with which the French translation is enriched are retained. These notes enable the reader to understand more fully the writings of the great Saint and holy Doctor.

The Latin Scripture texts and Latin quotations from the Fathers, which the saintly author inserted in his works, are given as foot-notes at the bottom of the proper pages. The sacred poetry, composed by St. Alphonsus, is interspersed through the different volumes of his ascetical works.

It were needless, if not arrogantly presumptuous, for us to attempt to add our feeble commendations to the splendid testimonials given by almost countless eminent theologians and Sovereign Pontiffs of the Church to the usefulness and value, the power for lucid instruction and

holy edification of the works of Saint Alphonsus. Suffice it to say, that the learned and holy Popes Benedict XIV., Clement XIV., Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII., Gregory XVI., Pius IX., and Leo XIII., have concurred and united in praising and commending them.

TRIUMPHANT DEMOCRACY, OR FIFTY YEARS' MARCH OF THE REPUBLIC. By *Andrew Carnegie*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1886.

Mr. Carnegie, a native of Scotland, and a naturalized citizen of the United States, is possessed of an unbounded admiration for his adopted country, its institutions, its progress, its wealth, prosperity and future promise. He has written the book before us for a double purpose.

One of these purposes is to show "the people, the plain, common folk, the democracy of Britain . . . the prosperity and happiness of this Republic, that they . . . may learn that the government of the people through the republican form is the surest foundation of individual growth and of national greatness."

His other purpose is "to give to the whole body of Americans a juster estimate than prevails in some quarters, of the political and social advantages they so abundantly possess over the people of the older and less advanced lands."

As regards the external aspects of various elements which enter into the industrial, political and social condition of the people of the United States Mr. Carnegie's book is interesting and useful. It is crowded with facts and figures, which he evidently has spent much time and labor in gathering, and great care in arranging and collating. His descriptions of the conditions of life, the occupations, the cities and towns, the education, the agriculture, manufactures, mines, trade and commerce, railways and water-ways, and kindred topics are graphic and of roseate hue.

He has chapters upon Religion, Pauperism and Crime, Art and Music, Literature, etc. But their treatment is statistical, and, if not superficial, is confined to the external aspects of these subjects.

The work is interesting and for some purposes useful, but on some points it is unsatisfactory and one-sided.

THE DIVINE OFFICE CONSIDERED FROM A DEVOTIONAL POINT OF VIEW: From the French of M. l'Abbé Bacquez, Director of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris. Edited by the Rev. *Ethelred L. Taunton, Oblate of St. Charles*. With a preface by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

This book is intended specially for "priests and ministers in holy orders;" and a most useful and excellent companion it is for all who recite the Divine Office. It is an adaptation rather than a translation from the French, and it does, we think, as its English editor ventures to hope, "supply a want long felt among the clergy and others who have to use the Breviary." For the sake of its literary style and excellent composition it should be the subject of high esteem; but far more so, of course, "for its object and for the end it has in view." Taking the prayers that priests recite each day, the author shows their meaning and beauty, and so "gives an idea of the treasures of wisdom and piety which result from a profound study of them." There can be nothing more interesting nor with which ecclesiastics can occupy themselves with greater advantage. "To say the Divine Office as it ought to be said," remarks Cardinal Manning in the Preface, "would fill us with inex-

haustible matter of mental prayer, for it is the work of the Holy Ghost and of the Saints. The seven hours are seven visits day by day to the heavenly court ; our voice is united to the eternal adoration ; and our daily office ascends in the Golden Censer with the prayers of the Saints." The Abbé Bacquez tells how this takes place.

THE GREEK ISLES AND TURKEY AFTER THE WAR. By *Henry M. Field, D.D.* New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.

It is a great pity that such a pleasant book of travels should be spoiled by an altogether unnecessary and certainly unprofitable "boasting" of Protestant missionaries and colleges in the Levant countries, while not a word is said of the well-known Catholic Missionary efforts in the same region, nor of the celebrated Catholic University of Beirut. This obtrusion and this omission cannot fail to hurt the feelings of Catholic readers, who would otherwise thoroughly enjoy the bright sketches which the author of "From the Lakes of Killarney to the Golden Horn" knows so well how to strike off. Almost as it were in a panorama he takes the reader from Beirut to Cyprus, thence along the shores of Asia Minor, through the Greek Archipelago, by Smyrna, Mitylene and Troy, through the Dardanelles to Constantinople. With his descriptions he happily combines sketches of character and the most striking historical reminiscences. Apropos of Constantinople he betrays strong symptoms of Turkophobia. Leaving Stamboul, he goes along the Black Sea and through Bulgaria, the story of whose sufferings and liberation he graphically tells, adding thereto an account of the Russo-Turkish War. An account of a trip up the Danube closes the volume, which is furnished with three well-executed maps.

THE RAILWAYS AND THE REPUBLIC. By *James F. Hudson.* New York : Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1886.

This is an opportune and a useful volume. The perversion of railways from their original and legitimate purpose, their needless and unjust discriminations, their favoritism to some and their extortionate oppression of others, their corruption of public officials, of municipal corporations, of legislators and courts, by which means they have grown into close corporations which divert trade and traffic from its natural channels and centres, which limit and contract its volume, or unduly expand it ; which have become a virtual *imperium in imperio* in our commonwealth, to the great injury of the public interests, the crushing-out of individual enterprise, the making of personal thrift and foresight and honest industry profitless, and the building up of a plutocracy amongst us—these and other facts bearing on the general subject are plainly brought to light in this volume.

The subjects of Railway Domination, Discrimination, Public Obligations and Corporate Practices, the Pooling Policy, the Fictitious Element in Railway Policy, Competition *versus* Combination, are candidly, fairly, and ably treated. Then follow two chapters on "Remedies." The work concludes with a chapter on "Corporations in Politics."

ENGLMANN'S LATIN GRAMMAR. Improved and edited by *P. Augustine Schneider, O. S. B.* Cincinnati : Anton Bicker, 1885. 8vo, pp. 425.

A very good and useful grammar, but too ample and extensive for beginners. A boy is apt to get frightened when he sees the 425 pages

which are to be compressed into his little cranium. The syntax, however, may be gone over twice, leaving out the first time everything but the general rules. The translator from the German original is Father Schneider, a Benedictine of St. Vincent's Abbey, Pennsylvania. The versified rules are, we think, no help to the learner's memory. The affixes or inflexions of the verb are in different type from the root, which is very useful in marking for the boy from the beginning the difference between stem and affix. The word *value* (p. 225, line 12) should be changed into some passive or intransitive verb (to be valued, to be worth, or something of the kind).

SANCTUARY-BOYS' ILLUSTRATED MANUAL, embracing the Ceremonies of the Inferior Ministers at Low Mass, High Mass, Solemn High Mass, Vespers, Asperges, Benediction of the Bl. Sacrament, and Absolution for the Dead. By *Rev. James A. McCallen, S.S.* Published with the approval of the Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore. Fourth edition. Baltimore: Foley Brothers. 1886. Small 8vo, pp. 168.

We are glad that this excellent little work has reached its fourth edition. It shows clearly that whatever has intrinsic merit, sooner or later wins its way to popular favor. This "Manual" is the fruit of the author's accurate liturgical studies, and of his mature experience in the teaching and practice of the sacred ceremonies in the Sulpitian Seminary of St. Mary's and in the Cathedral of Baltimore, where they are carried out with wonderful exactness and to the greatest edification of the faithful. We hope that it will soon be everywhere in the hands of the Altar boys and of the Clergy also, to whom it will be an invaluable help in training the young to the service of the Altar.

THE LATIN POEMS OF LEO XIII. Done into English Verse by the *Jesuits of Woodstock College*. Published with the Approbation of His Holiness. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1886.

The poems contained in this volume are on various subjects and were written at various times; but they all breathe the same spirit of fervent piety and devotion, as they are also characterized by like grace of expression. It must have been no easy task to translate them, pregnant as they are with sublime and holy ideas and conceptions, faithfully rendered into English, rude and unformed as that language is in comparison with classic Latin, and compressed in thought and elegant and polished in diction as these poems are. Yet difficult as was the work, "the Jesuits of Woodstock College" undertook it, and they have well performed it.

The typographical setting, in which Messrs. John Murphy & Co. have placed these poetic gems, befits their lustre and value.

THE LIFE OF FATHER LUKE WADDING, FOUNDER OF ST. ISIDORE'S COLLEGE, ROME, ETC. By the *Rev. Joseph A. O'Shea, O.S.F.* Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1885.

The literary execution of this book does not render it worthy of the great subject to whom it is devoted. One of Ireland's most glorious ecclesiastics of the "Reformation" period deserves a more exhaustive and a better written biography; and we are glad to learn that such a monument is to be raised to the memory of the author of "*Scriptores Ordinis Minorum*," and "*Annales Minorum*." This, however, may be only a remote possibility, and until then, Father O'Shea's memoir, which, by the way, is furnished with a fairly well-executed portrait, will serve to revive in the minds and hearts of Irishmen the memory of one who did them honor in the Eternal City.

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below

20M-8-46

Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 020 069 352

205 American Catho
A5123 1886

NAME

DATE

